University of Alberta

Anatomy of Pestilence:
The Satiric Disgust of Plague in Early Modern London
(1563-1625)

by

Nat Wayne Hardy ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2000

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-59596-X

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Nat Wayne Hardy

Title of Thesis: Anatomy of Pestilence: The Satiric Disgust of Plague in Early Modern London (1563-1625)

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 2000

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

1425 Drehr Avenue
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
U.S.A., 70808-1039

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Anatomy of Pestilence: The Satiric Disgust of Plague in Early Modern London (1563-1625)" submitted by Nat Wayne Hardy in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Jonathan Hart

Dr. Glenn Burger

Lesley Cormack
Dr. Lesley Cormack

Patricia Demers
Dr. Patricia Demers

Dr. Julian Martin

Dr. Gordon Teskey

Abstract

This dissertation investigates the satirical anatomy of pestilence and the satiric disgust of plague in early modern London. Through the metaphor of the anatomy, satirical anatomists dissected and refashioned the threatened abject bodies of plague: the uninfected bodies and infected bodies of epidemical London. These discursively constructed bodies were symbolically dismembered in a rhetorical invective of blame and disgust.

The introduction establishes a definition of plague satire and constructs a methodological framework for its theoretical and historical method. This "grotesque historicism" contextualizes the social and intellectual climate, and the satirical temper as it affects both the early modern conception of "pestilential visitations" and our own understanding of epidemical crisis.

Chapter one investigates the emergence of the satirical anatomy, the disciplinary violence and fraudulent empiricism of these allegorical vivisections, and how disgust was used to represent plague in the early modern period.

The second chapter explores the mythical origins of the uninfected, abject body; an excremental ontology that was largely fashioned out of embellished biblical typologies. This section demonstrates how satirists used religion and natural philosophy to deform and muddy the grotesque body, a methodology that reestablished the body as a defiling vessel of dung.

Chapter three examines the infected body's toxic discharges and its taxonomy of suppurating sores. This chapter explains how the deformed body was punished through retributive justice, and why this discharging vessel was scapegoated as a source of fear and loathing owing to its contaminating presence.

The fourth chapter investigates the infected body's miasmatic effluents and the hysteria of smells. This chapter examines how anatomising satirists dissected

the stench of pestilence, how the defiling moral properties of smells mirrored the profane state of the body and the city, and how the repulsive odours of plague reinforced the phobic response to pestilence..

The conclusion suggests the importance of a grotesque history of plague satire, a history distorted through the metaphor of the anatomy. This concluding section surveys how the the anatomy helped cultivate a phobic hatred and misanthropical disgust for the "undisplaced myths" of this retributive disease and its sufferers.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the help and support of many people. This thesis is very much a product of my mentors who influenced its course. Jonathan Hart has been an exceptional supervisor helping me direct and negotiate this dissertation. I am grateful for his insights, guidance, vigilence, expedient revisions and above all, his humanity.

I will always be appreciative for the exceptional generosity of the University of Alberta and the Faculty of Graduate Studies who conferred several fellowships, awards, and travel bursuries which permitted me to travel to Europe on three occasions for research and conference presentations. Two summers of productive reading at the Bodleian Library, Oxford and London's Wellcome Historical Institute and four thesis-related conference papers were the fruition of these continental forays. A special thank you to Dean of Arts Patricia Clements, Robert Merrett, Associate Dean of External Affairs, and Associate Vice-President of Research and External Affairs, Bill McBlain, who helped me arrange funding for a conference trip to Montalcino, Italy where I presented part of Chapter 3 at the "Cities Under Siege Conference" in July, 1999.

This thesis has benefited from an interdisciplinary committee of literary scholars and historians. Lesley Cormack has been instrumental throughout this study in directing me away from a defective historiography. Her scholarly knowledge of medical history enabled me to see "the big picture" of plague in early modern London. Glenn Burger was especially helpful in directing the theoretical methodology of this study at a formative stage of development. Pat Demers' course on Renaissance Women Writers enabled me to include women writers in this almost exclusively male domain. Julian Martin has been exceptionally generous with his time, comments, and genuine interest in this project. His unrivalled knowledge of Bacon was humbling and our discussions were always intensely informative and

entertaining. Finally, the department's very own dean of disgust, Robert Wilson, was inspirational and ultimately encouraging in the formulation of this study's work on disgust. I appreciate and envy his profound knowledge and I thank him for letting me run amok under his tutelage during course work on postmodernism.

At the University of Alberta, John Charles and Jeannine Green at Bruce Peel Special Collections Library were always exceptionally kind and accomodating as were the Rutherford Library staff, particularly Michael May and Jenni Feldman, who consistently went out of their way whenever I required assistance. The librarians at the Bodleian Library Oxford and the Wellcome Institute Library in London were especially friendly and helpful. Also Eugene Bacungan at UMI in Ann Arbor, Michigan was instrumental in helping me locate newly filmed pamphlets not listed in the STC Catalogue.

My gratitude to many people in the Department of English. I am beholden to Rick Bowers and Greg Hollingshead for initially engendering my interest in plague literature via Dekker and Defoe. Thanks to Jean MacIntyre and James Marino for scholarly kindness over the years. A particular thank you also to and to Chris Bullock, Kristjana Gunnars, Janice Williamson, Jonathan Hart, Jo-Ann Wallace, and Juliet McMaster for supporting my creative writing and for inspiring me to pursue graduate studies. Many thanks to Mary Marshall Durrell and Kim Nicholson in the Department of English who were always kind and helpful when I frequently called upon them.

A special and heartfelt thanks especially to Judy Kahn at my new academic home, Louisiana State University. Judy's unrivaled kindness and support during the closing stages of the thesis will always be remembered. Especial thanks of encouragement also to Rodger Kamenetz, Dave Smith, Carol Mattingly, John Fischer, Janine Conant, Janet Barnwell, Amy Verner and my many new friends and colleagues at LSU.

Finally, I owe much to Christian Riegel who has been a superior friend and colleague who helped me in many ways over the course of my doctoral studies. A huge thank you also to my other now-professorial comrades in arms: Bernie Kavanagh at Queen's University, Monique Tschofen at Ryerson Polytechnic, and Rod Beattie at University of Newcastle, Sydney, Australia. My enduring gratititude to many friends and relatives, in particular, Mark Turner, David Galloway, Jackie Latimer, Dianna Ducs, David Whalen, Erika Rothwell, Michael Mitchell, and Aunt Jane Galloway. To my mother I will always owe great debts, financial and familial.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: The Satirical Anatomy of Early Modern London 43

i) *Anatomia Comparata*: Satire versus Natural Philosophy 43
ii) Gross Anatomy: The Sadistic Sublime 47
iii) Anatomising Absurdity and Satirical *Malpraxis* 56
vi) 'Morall Goore with pleasaunt penne in hande': Scribing the Anatomy 65
v) The Mirror Which Flatters Not: Neo-Platonic Cultural Mapping 70
vi) The Dangerous Truths of the 'New Anatomie' 75
vii) Satirical Vivisection and the Quick Anatomy 84
viii) Satyr-Masochism: Lashing the Naked and the Living Dead 91

Chapter 2: The Uninfected Body 98

i) Anatomising the Vile Healthy Body 98
ii) Corruption Incarnate: Satirical Bodily Matter 100
iii) Manufacturing an Excremental Ontology or 'Botties That Matter' 112
iv) Mapping the Excremental Exterior: The Abject Ordure 116
v) Muddy Fluids: The Bowels of Incompassion and Humoural Anarchy 126
vi) Viscous Mud: A Mucky Corporeality 133
vii) *Creatio Ex Stercore*: Donne and the 'Vessels of Dung' 139

Chapter 3: The Infected Body I 146

i) Anatomising 'Infected Bodies That Didn't Matter' 146
ii) 'The Foul Stigmatic': Abject Sin 149
iii) Pestilence 'Character'd in Blame': The Infectious Scapegoat 157
iv) 'Bodies Making Anatomies in Wounds' or the Taxonomy of Sores 166
v) Pestilential Emissions: Discharging Infection 195

Chapter 4: The Infected Body II 213

i) Anatomising 'Noysome' Effluvia: The Stench of Infection 213
ii) 'Plague-Smeller Purseuvants' and the Noxious Volatility of Pestilence 217
iii) 'Pestiferous Miasmata': The Hysteria of Smells 225
iv) The Malthusian Odour of Infectious Poverty 233
v) 'Pestilent Airs With Flavours to Repulse': The Toxic Interplay of Stench 236

Table of Contents cntd.

Conclusion 248

Primary Bibliography 254

Secondary Bibliography 272

Symbols and Abbreviations

AA	*The Anatomie of Abuses*
AAP	*An Apology for Poetry or The Defence of Poesy*
ABT	*A Brief Treatise of the Nature... and Cure of The Pestilence.*
ADP	*A Defensitive against the Plague*
ALH	*The Anatomical Lectures of William Harvey*
AMS	*A most Sweete and assured Comfort for all those in Conscience*
APA	*A Perfume against the noysome Pestilence*
ASF	*A salue for a sicke man, or, the right manner of dying well.*
ATP	*A treatise of the pestilence*
ATT	*A Treatise Tending Vnto A Declaration*
AF	*All Fools*
ALC	*The Alchemist*
AM	*The Anatomy of Melancholy*
ANA	*A Newe Anatomie of whole man*
AON	*The Arke of Noah*
ASW	*Abuses stript, and whipt*
BBD	*Bulleins Bulwarke of Defence againste all Sicknesse, Soarnesse, and Woundes*
BRI	*Britains Remembrancer Part I*
BRII	*Britains Remembrancer Part II*
CSB	*Chrestoleros. Seuen Bookes of Epigrames*
CSC	*Certaine Sermons Concerning Gods Late visitation in the cite of London*
CR	*Cynthias Reuells*
CMC	*A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*
DB	*The divells blanket*
DF	*The Tragicall History of Doctor Faustus*
DFP	*A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence*
DNB	*Dictionary of National Biography* CD ROM
DOD	*The Droomme of Doomes day*
DOM	*The Duchess of Malfi*
DOS	*Diseases of the Sovle: A Discourse Divine, Morall, and Physicall.*
EMI	*Every Man In His Humour*
EMO	*Every Man Out of His Humour*
ES	*Englands Sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels*
FQ	*The Faerie Queene*
GH	*The Gull's Hornbook*
HBL	*Hell's broke loose*
HH	*Humours Heau'n on Earth*
HP	*The History of the Pestilence*
LGP	*Loimographia: An Account of The Great Plague of 1665*
LMG	*Londons Mourning Garment or Funerall Teares:*
LHM	*Lord have Mercy upon Vs. The World, A Sea, A Pest-house*
LPA	*Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized*
MAL	*The Malcontent*
MC	*Microcosmos. The Discovery of the Little World, with the government thereof*
MCM	*Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man*
MOA	*A New Discourse of a Stale Subject, Called the Metamorphosis of Ajax*
OED	*The Oxford English Dictionary* CD ROM
OGH	*The Optick Glasse of Hvmors*

Symbols and Abbreviations cntd.

PPD	*The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker*
RA	*The Ravens Almanacke. Fortelling of a Plague, Famine, and Civill Warre*
SDS	*The Seuen deadly Sins of London*
SIP	*The signes that doe declare a person to be infected with the pestilence*
SOV	*Scourge of Villainie*
SPA	*Spirituall Preservatives against the pestilence*
SPT	*Spiritual physicke to cure the diseases of the soule*
SSA	*Seauen Satires Applyed to the weeke, including the worlds ridiculous follyes*
TAN	*The Arke of Noah*
TD	*The Triumph of Death*
TKM	*The kings medicine for this present yeere 1604*
TWL	*The Weeping Lady: Or, London Like Ninivie in Sack-Cloth*
TP	*The Poetaster*
TSC	*The Soddered Citizen*
UFT	*The Unfortunate Traveller*
VOL	*Volpone*
WMP	*Watch-Man for the Pest*

Shakespeare's Works (in Folio order of citation)

MWW	*The Merry Wives of Windsor*
MM	*Measure for Measure*
ERR	*The Comedy of Errors*
MV	*The Merchant of Venice*
WT	*The Winter's Tale*
JN	*King John*
H5	*King Henry V*
2H6	*The Second Part of King Henry the Sixth*
KH8	*The Famous History of The Life of King Henry the Eighth*
T&C	*Troilus and Cressida*
COR	*Coriolanus*
ROM	*Romeo and Juliet*
TIM	*Timon of Athens*
HAM	*Hamlet*
KL	*The Tragedy of King Lear*
ANT	*Antony and Cleopatra*
STM	*Saint Thomas More*
VEN	*Venus and Adonis*
RL	*The Rape of Lucrece*
SON	*The Sonnets*

Introduction

This study examines the anatomical metaphor employed by early modern writers within the satirical discourse of plague. Working through a disruptive trinity -- satire, anatomy and disgust -- early modern "Rymesters, Play-patchers, Jigmakers, Ballad-mongers & Pamphlet-stitchers" (*PPD* 70) catalogued and "carbanadoed" (Lupton i) a distortedly grotesque history of epidemical London. Plague satire's ideological implications[1] were not only religiously conservative but invectively violent; directed at shaming a sinful populace into piety. This propensity to dissect and vivisect culture, vice, and bodies pervades the intensely visceral discourse of plague in early modern London. By debasing the body both physically and morally in a rhetoric of contempt, the city and its inhabitants were grotesquely abjected through the satirical anatomy.

Epidemics recurred throughout the early modern period and there were only a handful of years that were plague-free. The visionary writer Anthony Nixon was not exaggerating when he wrote in *The Blacke yeare* [1606] that London would "neuer be without diseases" (Nixon C1). Disease, famine and pestilence were all part of the often stark reality of the urban Renaissance experience. Early modern satirical writers were opportunists who preyed on such disasters. As they interpreted and recorded these tragic events, however, they also blurred the distinction between history and fiction; realism and fantasy.

This dissertation is framed by two major epidemics of the Elizabethan and Jacobean reigns: the plague of 1563, when London experienced a mortality rate of

---

[1] See Hayden White's ***Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe***, 28-29.

24% with 17,404 plague deaths, and the plague of 1625, when the city suffered a rate of 20.1% with 26,350 plague deaths.[2] Although London was rarely free of pestilence, the reactionary paranoia of plague peaked especially so between and during 1563 and 1625 as major outbreaks also struck the city in 1578 (a 7.8% mortality rate with 3,568 plague deaths), 1593 (a 14.3% mortality rate with 10,675 plague deaths), and 1603 (a 22.6% mortality rate with 25,045 plague deaths),[3] making a profound cultural impact on the city and its literature. The literary works examined in this study, therefore, reflect the stereotypes, the phobias, and the hostilities of a Renaissance city under epidemical siege.

For early modern Londoners the "sublime mystery" (*LPA* 9) of plague continued to generate further paranoid fears of an abject disease "whose very naming seeme[d] t'affright" (A.H. 59) writers and their audiences. As Thomas Swadling said, "A killing word, the plague is" (Swadling 155): the disease signalled fear and terror for a "wretched and transitory world" (Man 303-04) in the grip of epidemic. And as Michael Neill puts it, "No other single phenomenon had a more decisive effect than plague in shaping the early modern crisis of death" (Neill 15). In discourse marked by the tragic theme of mass mortality, authors writing in all genres retold the horrors of epidemic London by depicting plague as the most "abiectest thing" the city ever confronted (Bright 33). This "Plaguy Allarum" was struck by an array of satirical writers who offered rather repulsive descriptions of plague to their literate consumers (*PPD* 74). Festooned in aversive language, the "MORBVS EPIDEMICVS," (Pestell 16) remained the "hallucinatory metaphor of the phobic" (Kristeva 44) for the early moderns: a grotesque disease with abject significance, for this was a period of renewed intolerance towards sin, filth and "The Horror of a Plague, the Hell" (*PPD* 82). The cultural investment in the literature of the plague attested to its lingering presence because the cruel aesthetic experience was recorded and dissected by satirists *ad nauseam*.

---

[2] See Slack's "Table 6.1: Major epidemics in London 1563-1665" in ***The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England***, 151.
[3] Ibid., 151.

While there was no "hornbook" devoted to pestilence, considerable cultural capital, both literary and monetary, was devoted to plague. After three centuries of persistence in London, plague was a well-established *topos* of debate while the accompanying language of pestilence became entrenched within the early modern English idiom, making a poignant impact on the literary landscape. Of course, Renaissance theatre critics might contest the fact that there were no Tudor or Stuart plays openly ascribed to plague[4] – no *The Devil is a Pestilent Ass* or *The Plague of Edmonton*, no *Knight of the Burning Pestilence* or *The Taming of the Plague* – hundreds of satirical works were, however, inspired by plague.[5] Throughout the early modern period plague was, to use Ben Jonson's dramatic title, *A Staple of News*, and as this project will argue, the language of disease and infection festooned the satirical literature of the period, establishing plague as a tragic and heuristic aspect of Elizabethan and Jacobean London's culture.

While early modern London had long been the subject of intense scrutiny by moralising writers, it was in plague time that the city received its most scathing social commentary, as most satirical writers responded to the disease and its high mortality with shock, horror, contempt and blame. Through the authoritative words of sometimes contradictory voices (Thomas Churchyard's *A feast full of sad cheere* [1592] comes to mind), a "plaguy" *memento mori* developed in London's flourishing print culture; a world unaware that plague's "pricke of conscience" was disseminated by a regurgitative flea bite.

---

[4] As a point of interest, Shakespeare's tragedy *Romeo and Juliet* [1595] and Ben Jonson's comedy *The Alchemist* [1610] were both situated in pestilential settings: Mantua and London respectively.

[5] A brief random sample of some of the more notable plague-inspired works include: William Bullein's Menippean satire, *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1563]; John Davies of Hereford's *The Triumph of Death: or, The Picture of the Plague: According to the Life, as it was in Anno Domini 1603* [1605]; A.H.'s *London Looke-backe: A description or representation of the great and memorable Mortality An. 1625, in Heroicke matchless lines*, Dekker's plague pamphlets and the epic poems of George Wither, *The History of the Pestilence* [1626] and *Britains Remembrancer* [1628].

The visceral response to plague in the early modern period is grotesque and unprecedented and provides a rich repository of historical and literary artifacts which offer insights into the crisis of epidemic. To varying degrees all the writers in this study[6] had a personal investment in plague and that is precisely why they responded in print. These literary and historical portraits of plague in early modern London invite close-readings and explications and thus this study explores satirical writers experiencing and dissecting plague through the metaphor of the anatomy.

I

This introduction outlines the theoretical framework and historical method that form the basis for the readings of primary texts that follow. I begin by examining the distinctions between this study and other literary and historical studies. Within the discipline it is important to demonstrate a framework of theory and historical method. While I am not emphasizing theory and historical method in the close-readings, it is essential to set out such a framework for them. This frame includes three key aspects of this study: first, what makes this study distinct from other literary and historical studies; second, my methodological framework, and why I have chosen to work with these primary texts and to use them as the basis not just of my reading but as part of my method; and third, what is my means of making sense of the material I define as the anatomical poetics of plague satire.

---

[6] Where appropriate, this study will refer to the writer's biography, because all the writers examined knew well of epidemical conditions; some themselves, perished from plague. Many of those who survived undoubtedly lost friends and family to pestilence.

As the literature and history of the period demonstrate, plague was one of the most notorious "facts" of life the early moderns had to contend with. The substantial volume of works either dedicated to plague or alluding to the disease has been examined by a number of historians but has been largely overlooked by literary critics.[7] Indeed, no extensive study has explored the satire of plague despite its compelling literary impact. This neglected discursive domain merits exploration because it offers insights into English Renaissance culture; especially the social impact pestilence had upon London, which cultural historian Paul Slack discusses in *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* [1990].[8] Slack's unprecedented study examines the cultural history of the plague in early modern England, whereas this study focuses on the ways in which the satirical literature of the plague in Elizabethan and Jacobean London interpreted and dissected the travails of plague.

Unquestionably, recurring plagues made a profound social impact on the cultural history of early modern London as the works of Slack and other historians suggest.[9] As Slack articulates, the plague debate involved writers of various backgrounds and ideologies, and this "historical phenomenon of plague" -- how pestilence affected and impacted Elizabethan and Jacobean print culture in London -- pervades the discourse (Slack 1990: xiii). Slack's work is instrumental in providing historical grounding[10] for work in this area, but he does not present a literary interpretation of plague-ridden London.

---

[7] Barbara Fass Leavy's more recent study, *To Blight With Plague: Studies in a Literary Theme* [1992], examined plague thematically. This project, however, moves beyond Leavy's critical insights by investigating plague's more prominent status as a sinister motif; an insistent and malignant anatomical trope. Despite Leavy's thesis, the vivid presence and allusory accounts of plague, as this study will argue, served didactic rather than thematic ends in Elizabethan and Jacobean discourse.

[8] Without question, Slack's study, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* [1990] offers the most comprehensive historical overview of the plague experience in early modern England. Slack's historical research surpasses the previous attempts of F.P. Wilson's *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* [1963] and J.F.D. Shrewsbury's *A History of Bubonic Plague in the British Isles* [1970].

[9] This study has also profited from several other historical studies which survey plague across human history. Geddes Smith's *Plague On Us* [1941], Charles F. Mullett's *The Bubonic Plague and England: An Essay in the History of Preventative Medicine* [1956]; Erwin H. Ackerknecht's *History and Geography of the Most Important Diseases* [1965]; J.F.D. Shrewsbury's *A History of Bubonic Plague in the British Isles* [1970]; William H. McNeill's *Plagues and Peoples* [1976]; Andrew Nikiforuk's *The Fourth Horseman: A Short History of Epidemics, Plagues, Famine and Other Scourges* [1991]; Arien Mack's *In Time of Plague: The History and Social Consequences of Lethal Epidemic Disease* [1991]; and George C. Kohn's *Encyclopedia of Plague and Pestilence* [1995] are just a few of the more prominent texts which have further contributed to the contextual grounding of this dissertation.

Quite deliberately, then, this study, while remaining historicist, diverges from Slack's and other historical research by venturing away from the social response and delving more into the literary, or more specifically, the satirical response to plague. This thesis makes a contribution because it is the only extensive survey which examines solely the "satirical reaction" to pestilence in early modern London. A number of other critical texts, most notably Raymond Crawfurd's P*lague and Pestilence in Literature and Art* [1914]; F.P. Wilson's *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* [1963]; Leeds Barroll's *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater: The Stuart Years* [1991];[11] and Barbara Fass Leavy's *To Blight With Plague: Studies in a Literary Theme* [1992] provide a useful generalized overview and a thematic reading of plague throughout literary history. This thesis departs from the limitations of these more general studies in that this project is directed and focused specifically on the satirical anatomy in Elizabethan and Jacobean London.

What ultimately distinguishes this study from other projects is that it enters the rhetorical foray of epidemic where satire and history collide, where fiction did battle with fact, and where Christian myth deformed medical reality. This project reexamines the misanthropically inclined satirists who vented their moral outrage by carving up London, violently dissecting and vivisecting the inhabitants in a more literal and absurdist way than has been discussed by other critics. Historical and theoretical commentary on the plague provide invaluable background for the close re-examination of the discourse through the recurring metaphor of the anatomy. The primary texts yield a theory which inverts and complicates the view of what early modern plague literature was.

---

[10] Part of the contribution of my study is to supplement the fine work of a historian like Slack with the perspective of literary history.

[11] While Barroll's research proved beneficial to [illegible] study, Barroll focuses not on satire but on the impact plague had on the dramatists and the theatre in Stuart London, his insights are, therefore, useful but limited.

II

The methodological framework for this study arose principally from an exploratory and inductive process. This method, which the work of other scholars and historians has bolstered, helps to provide an effective frame for the close-reading of this vast plague literature. Despite the mythical nature of the discourse of plague, there exists no theoretical philosopher's stone, no alchemical paradigm, or no methodological elixir at our disposal which will facilitate uncomplicated access to these texts. Historical analysis and contemporary contextual commentary do, however, provide the most appropriate, though not exhaustive, way to observe the diverse portrayal of the plague.

Michel Foucault remains perhaps one of the most important critical influences on my own ideological understanding of cultural history. The poststructuralist disciplinary mechanisms Foucault addresses – what Foucault defines as a "surveillant culture" and the cellular structure of the *cordon sanitaire*, in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* [1979], for example – is particularly useful in contextualizing the disciplinary will of the Plague Orders of early modern London. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception* [1994] was another helpful text for the formative development of my method. While the "medical gaze" in *The*

Birth of the Clinic proved fruitful, it does not apply directly to my topic because, if anything, satire inverts or flatly rejects the "medical gaze" to which Foucault addresses so eloquently. The satirical gaze of the early moderns dismisses what we would define as natural causes in favour of supernatural or divine origins of disease. As insightful as the "gaze" is, the ocular metaphor has informed but limited applications to this project.

To incorporate Foucault's ideas wholesale into this study is problematic at best. There are several obvious reasons for distancing this study from Foucault's works. One important archival drawback to *Discipline and Punish*, for example, is that Foucault's cultural observations are set within Enlightenment France. To a considerable degree, then, I had little choice but to abandon many Foucauldian social insights in the cause of historical accuracy and empirical validity. Whereas Foucault's poststructuralism addresses the disciplinary force of state power in a physical sense, my study concentrates more on the relation between power and the symbolic body. For the literature of plague in London, as this study sees it, the body is not simply an instrument of state power but the instrument of the satirist's will (or arguably, the divine right of the satirist): in the anatomy,[12] the satirist is king and condemner. One other important departure from Foucault's poststructuralist focus, which centres upon the disciplinary will of the state, then, is that this study is more concerned with the disciplinary will of the "real" satirist dissecting and refashioning "imaginary" bodies in plague time. Foucault's critical observations on one front encapsulate the satirical posturings within epidemic when he describes "the plague as a form, at once real and imaginary," (Foucault *Discipline* : 198). But while plague was a real experience for the early moderns, satirical writers shifted the cause of disease out of the natural order of natural philosophy and into the symbolic realm of the imaginary and mythological.

---

[12] When this study refers to "the anatomy" it is referring to the satirical and not legitimate anatomy. The term "satyr-anatomist" is used frequently and is merely an alternative epithet for the anatomising satirist.

Rather than use a Foucauldian historical method, I have focused on the literary representations of epidemic, all the while concentrating on the early modern historical context. Cultural theorists and historians have already fleshed out the disciplinary nature of plague through social history and theory, including René Girard's seminal works, *Violence and the Sacred* [1977] and *The Scapegoat* [1986], thus this study focuses its attentions on the disciplinary narratives of London's early modern satirical writers. This project confines itself to the satirical power of the author who disciplines symbolic bodies via the anatomy. In this study, the interpretive strategies shift away from the political body to the literary or discursive body. In a quasi-Foucauldian way, the satirist becomes both dissector and panopticonal narrator in a setting where infected and uninfected bodies were fashioned and refashioned through the satirical anatomy. In this apolitical symbolic realm, the satirist works not for the state, but for the Almighty.

III

Operating through a historical framework, this study also draws upon the critical insights drawn by body theorists such as Mikhail Bakhtin, Judith Butler, and Thomas Laqueur.[13] To supplement the historicist emphasis of this project, this study develops a model of the grotesque body which will prove valuable in interpreting the macrocosmic body of early modern London.[14] The ethnographical models developed by the French cultural theorists, Julia Kristeva and René Girard, as well as the anthropological insights of Mary Douglas and others,[15] provide invaluable frames of reference for negotiating the scapegoating of retributive disease -- the shame, blame and guilt of epidemic -- the moralist propaganda of plague. Finally, recent research in the theory of disgust[16] illustrates how the moral grotesque functioned in the anatomy of plague as writers transcended the bounds of decency and decorum through satirical invective. Where legitimate anatomy attempted to contain the body, satire tried to subvert it, to reinscribe the body as an allegorical site.[17] The composite paradigm of this study will reveal how and why satirists employed an anatomical aesthetic to deconstruct plague; how blame functioned as a necessary cathartic response to disease; and, finally, why aversive language and repellent constructions of individuals and culture were used to absurdly grotesque lengths.

---

[13] From graduate course work at the onset of my PhD program I set out to formulate a body theory for this project after studying a variety of feminist theories of the body with Professor Jo-Ann Wallace. I am also grateful for the various discussions I had with Professor Glenn Burger who helped direct the method for understanding the grotesque spectacle of the dismembered plague body.

[14] There is no shortage of criticism on the grotesque. Indeed, a wealth of material is extant and useful in varying degrees. The texts consulted for this study include. Arthur Clayborough's *The Grotesque in English Literature* [1965], Arien Sachs' *The English Grotesque* [1969], Philip Thomson's *The Grotesque* [1972], Neil Rhodes' *Elizabethan Grotesque* [1980], Geoffrey Galt Harpham's *On the Grotesque* [1982], and Alton Kim Robertson's *The Grotesque Interface* [1996]. What separates the theoretical methodology of this study from the insights of previous critics is that this approach relates the grotesque body to an epidemical and tragically anatomical setting.

[15] Some of the more notable cultural studies of the plague experience will include: Geddes Smith's *Plague On Us* [1941]; Mary Douglas' *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* [1966]; Theodor Rosebury's *Life on Man* [1969]; Saul Nathaniel Brody's *The Disease of the Soul: Leprosy in Medieval Literature* [1974]; René Girard's *Violence and the Sacred* [1977]; Julia Kristeva's *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* [1982]; René Girard's *The Scapegoat* [1986]; Lucinda McCray Beier's *Sufferers and Healers: The Experience of Illness in Seventeenth-Century England* [1987]; Arien Mack's *In Time of Plague: The History and Social Consequences of Lethal Epidemic Disease* [1991]; Julia Epstein's *Altered Conditions: Disease, Medicine, and Storytelling* [1995]; Robert A. Hahn's *Sickness and Healing: An Anthropological Perspective* [1995]; and Gordon Teskey's *Allegory and Violence* [1996].

[16] Theories of disgust consulted for this study include: Norbert Elias' *The Civilizing Process: The History or Manners* [1978]; Martin Pops' "The Metamorphosis of Shit" [1982]; Peter Stallybrass and Allon White's *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* [1986]; William Miller's *Humiliation: And Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence* [1993]; Michael Lewis and Jeannette M. Haviland's *Handbook of Emotions* [1993]; Kelly Anspaugh's "The Powers of Ordure: James Joyce and the Excremental Vision(s)" [1994]; William Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust* [1997]; and Bruce Thomas Boehrer's *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal* [1997].

Among the recent proliferation of critical and cultural theories of the body,[18] a number or studies were useful in their own ways but most did not seem to have a direct application to what I was trying to derive from the body and disease in an early modern context. The discursive theories of Judith Butler's *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* [1993]; Thomas Laqueur's *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* [1990],[19] were of limited application to this study as my focus was the diseased body, not the sexed or gendered body. Julia Kristeva's pyschoanalytic readings of the scatological body in *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* [1982] were instrumental in helping formulate my own understanding of the abject infected body and what would later become what I understood to be the excremental uninfected body. Kristeva's theory of the abject body fits, therefore, ideally within an early modern pestilential setting, considering the fact that the two most abject objects in her schemata were the turd and the corpse (Kristeva 3-4). In London open sewers and dead bodies littered the streets in time of epidemic so that the waste reminders of life mingled with the cadaverous remembrances of death, a grotesque reality that the moralizing satirists seized on. Encased within a bodily construct "where meaning collapse[d]" (Ibid. 2), the scatological bodily construct was a prominent signifier throughout much of the disgusting exegesis of plague. The satirical body blurred the grotesque line between itself and the "kennels" it had to negotiate on a daily basis. Embellishing the domestic news of plague-ridden London with their moral asides, early modern writers fashioned not a carbon-based life form, but a dung-based one: a dirty corporeal composition overflowing with a sinful constitution. This was a degenerate body,[20] stigmatised to "generate alarm, disgust, contempt, embarrassment, concern, pity, or fear" (Miller *Anatomy*: 199). Corrupt in both body and soul and biblically fashioned from its excremental origins, the body was a foul receptacle, or, as John Donne put it in his sermon literature, an abject "Vessel of Dung"[21] incessantly prone to sin and disease.

---

[17] The grotesque and deforming appearance of buboes, carbuncles and tokens were emblematic of sin and an allegorical representation of the body interior as Miller argues: "Diseases that attack the skin in especially grotesque ways often came to be understood as allegories of the moral condition of the inside." See Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust*, 52.

Similarly, in *Allegory and Violence*, Gordon Teskey touches upon what I think can be described as an allegorical body. Although Teskey does not pursue this discursive body construct directly, his notion that allegory is more than literary representation of the ideological order can be, I think, applied to the satirical propaganda and anatomy of the early modern body (Teskey 17 &62). The concept of an allegorical body opens yet another provocative avenue of research which this study cannot address within the scope of this argument. See Teskey's *Allegory and Violence*, 17, 62, 76, & 84.

[18] This study has consulted a wealth of body theories but the most practical and intrinsically useful to this project include: Leonard Barkan's *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World* [1975]; Francis Barker's *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection* [1984]; Bryan S. Turner's *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory* [1984]; Elaine Scarry's *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* [1985]; Jonathan Crary, Michel Feher, Hal Foster and Sanford Kwinter's *Fragments for a History of the Human Body* [1989]; Bruce Clarke and Wendell Aycock's *The Body and The Text: Comparative Essays in Literature and Medicine* [1990]; Gail Kern Paster's *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* [1993];.Chris Shilling's *The Body and Social Theory* [1993]; Anthony Synnot's *The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society* [1993]; Richard Sennett's *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization* [1994]; and Jonathan Sawday's *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* [1995]. I will be citing these texts throughout the course of this study.

[19] I am grateful for the opportunity of having to speak with Professor Laqueur during his series of lectures delivered at the University of Alberta in 1998. His comments on my methodological dilemma were most helpful and inspiring at the time.

Within this satirical "ordure of things,"[22] early modern satirists were anatomising not a poststructuralist “docile body”[23] but a “volatile Renaissance body”;[24] a grotesque construct with a pronounced emphasis on excrement and disgust. This was not a self-fashioned body[25] in a new historicist sense, but a grotesque bodily construct determined largely through embellished biblical myth and typologies. Beyond the abject, the body manufactured by the satirical imaginations was a grotesque one. The insights of Mikhail Bakhtin’s classic Russian formalist work, *Rabelais and His World* [1984] proved most helpful for my method. Although the literature of plague was rarely carnival or festive, what struck me was how similar the parallels between the grotesque body of the medieval carnival bodies and the Renaissance plague bodies were. But the discourse of plague did not, however, play host to a celebrated carnivalesque body in a Bakhtinian tenor,[26] but rather, a

---

[20] See Chris Shilling's *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*, 273.

[21] The subtitle "Vessels of Dung" appears in "From a sermon preached at Essex House at the Churching of Lady Doncaster after childbirth (December 1618)." See *John Donne: A Critical Edition of the Major Work*, 280.

[22] This witty turn of phrase is from Bruce Boehrer's *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal*, 147.

---

23 In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Michel Foucault defines the docile body as that which “may be subjected, used, transformed and improved” (Foucault *Discipline*: 136). Within satirical anatomies, however, the early modern body was only “docile” in the sense that it was violently and reductively dissected in the symbolic realm. The satirist offered no implication that a positive “transformation” or “improvement” is possible as it is in a Foucauldian realm. If anything, the satirist reaffirmed the thoughtless folly of the human condition and the futile incapacity for positive change and ultimate reform.

24 The term “volatile body” comes from Judith Butler’s *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*, and while Butler’s study concerned sex and gender, her notion of discursive bodily matter is pertinent to this study, for the early modern satirical body did “matter” culturally but remained discursive “matter” in a textual sense.

25 In *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, Stephen Greenblatt argues that “there were both selves and a sense that they could be fashioned” (Greenblatt 1). For Greenblatt “Autonomy is an issue but not the sole or even the central issue: the power to impose a shape upon oneself is an aspect of the more general power to control identity – that of others at least as often as one's own” (Ibid. 1). While satirists admittedly “fashioned” the early modern body and “imposed shape” upon themselves and others, they “controlled identity” by following the misanthropic biblical and ascetic traditions inherited from the Middle Ages. In this sense, satirists were not “self-fashioning,” but rather, reaching historically backwards, and not innovatively forward as Greenblatt’s argument seems to imply. If anything, the Renaissance satirist revoked the sense of “self” as individual identity became subsumed within the revulsive collective body. Moreover, satirical representations challenge, if not, contradict Greenblatt’s thesis because they demonstrate a marked lack of autonomy with regard to fashioning the body by relying on biblical typologies and dogma for their anatomies. What satirists did do was run with scatological metaphors of the body to grotesque lengths, but to this end, the excremental fashioning was not accurate but simple, a pastiche regurgitation of misanthropic scriptural hostilities with a pronounced emphasis on disgust: a reductive “Othering” certainly, but not a textbook “self-fashioning.”

26 The satirical body this study examines and re-anatomises is very much a condemned body, the body-type Bakhtin’s study ignored. For Bakhtin, the grotesque body was an “ever-victorious” body that was at home in the cosmos” (Bakhtin 341), but the grotesque body of English satirical literature of the early modern period was consistently unvictorious and alien to the cosmos; consistently sinful, corrupt, and condemned as such.

condemned body in a grotesque masque.[27] If anything, the festive amorality Bakhtin located in Rabelais was in diametrical opposition to the heavy-handed didacticism of plague satire. Unlike Bakhtin's "scatological democracy" the political force of the early modern satirist was excrementally dictatorial at best (Harpham 73). In a pronounced sense, my theoretical method inverts Bakhtin's theory of the grotesque body. Instead of a celebrated body, this study analyses the "ambivalently normal" (Thomson 27) and "hybrid form" (Stallybrass and White 9) of the grotesque condemned body that is "always in process.. always becoming . . . [and] outgrowing all limits" (Ibid. 9). Indeed, where excremental matter "transform[ed] cosmic terror into a gay carnival monster" for Rabelais, as Bakhtin argues (Bakhtin 335), for the English satirist, ordure only reinforced the "cosmic terror," reducing the body to a repulsive abject monster of "dust, and nastie mud" (*HH* 44); an "adverse body, being earthly, cold, / Heauy dull," controlled by a "dungy, brutish, sensuall will" (*SOV* 90). Unlike the carnivalesque body of Rabelais, this was a uniquely grotesque English body. Perhaps Rabelaisian laughter was absent in English print culture because there was little humour to be drawn from the collective calamity of London in time of plague, although there was, of course, the odd exception.[28] Unlike Rabelais who wrote fantastically grotesque fiction, writers on plague were conveying the early modern equivalent of non-fiction; expressing the grim and filthy realities of urban epidemic through a repulsively grotesque body: not a comic but a tragic or melancholic abject body.

---

[27] While a carnivalesque theory of the grotesque body such as Bakhtin's works well in a Rabelaisian context, it is a problematic methodology for reading tragic themes such as plague. Indeed, the bodies of plague were the antithesis of the Bakhtin's location of the "element of utopian future" (Bakhtin 407) in Rabelais. If anything these tragic bodies of plague inhabit a dystopian present and an apocalyptic future. Moreover, the "category of laughter" that Rabelais was writing out of is patently absent in plague discourse (with, of course, the odd Dekkerian and Jonsonian exception).

[28] Dekker's *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603] and Jonson's *The Alchemist* [1610] and his poem, "On the Famous Voyage," are three examples which come to mind.

IV

The methodological approach of this study offers not a history of the body but "satirical modes" of bodily construction and deconstruction at a unique point in history: epidemical early modern London. As part of its historicist framework then, this study proposes a "bodily" paradigm for examining the principal bodies anatomised by satirists: the healthy or uninfected body, and the infected body. This dissective "body" theory operates under the assumption that bodies were satirically implicated in, and discursively constructed through, the history of epidemic and the providentialist ideology of plague.

Threatened by curses, violence, infection and mortality, the early modern body occupied an assailable status. Within the satirical anatomy the body was envisioned not as a passive victim of disease and mortality, but more as an aggressive and willing participant that brought about his own doom. Through satirical fashioning, writers constructed, anatomised, and deformed these dystopic bodies in an attempt to reform the early modern city. The satirist reinforced the plausibility of his discursive bodies by exploiting corporeal analogies from physical bodies, making the imaginary more real in the process,[29] much in the way that many writers allegorised London. By representing the city's macrocosmic tragedy microcosmically and vice versa, the urban bodies were reduced to infectious antihumanist signifiers of sin, disease and disgust. The misanthropic and Neoplatonic anatomy of Renaissance London had shoved humankind off its humanist pedestal: the sacred body made profane through shame, blame and guilt. Through a series of satirical dissections, the "tremulous private body"[30] had become an unflattering public anatomical spectacle, wherein the "body uglier grows" into a grotesquely symbolic construct (*TMP* IV ii).

---

[29] To strengthen a point made earlier, in the anatomy, the body, I think, becomes an allegorical site. The anatomising satirist seemed to execute an analogous approach to the body in a similar manner to his allegorising of London by fashioning it as a Sodom, a Babylon, or a sin-ridden and epidemical Jerusalem. By manufacturing the most vile bodies he could imagine, the satirist fused the symbolic with the physical with patently abject consequences.

During the recurring plague outbreaks of early modern London, then, there were -- apart from the anatomical sex/gender distinctions that Thomas Laqueur has investigated so extensively[31] -- essentially two bodily states:[32] the healthy or uninfected body and the infected or plague body. Both sick and sound states also applied to the Neoplatonic dichotomy between body and soul, one mirroring the other. To complicate bodily matter further, the physical or natural body was divided from its soul or spirit. According to the debate between Avarus and Medicus in William Bullein's *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578], bodies could also be "simple" or "mixed."[33] Beyond the simple and mixed body, the corporeal Renaissance body also contained the seven innate factors: the elements, humours, complexions, members, powers, operations and spirits.[34] Often unable to contain their interior wickedness, however, these "healthy" bodies were "bodyes bursting out in corruption" (Clapham 1604: 12) according to the puritanical Henoch Clapham, bodies which contaminated others in their effluential wake. However, where the archetypal humoral body was composed of four elements: earth, air, fire and water,[35] the early modern satirist reintroduced the fifth element -- dung -- the primary satirical element of human composition. According to the satirists' humoural and intestinal descriptions, the anatomised body was a body out of control, a corrupt and "leaky" vessel subsumed in the satire of the moral grotesque. To use Jonathan Dollimore's term, the inhabitants of London were "decentred subjects," a repulsive populace of abject bodies that were scapegoated for bringing plague upon London (Dollimore *Rad Tragedy*: xxx). London, the satirical writers argued, was overpopulated with menacing infectious bodies, whose abject status threatened not only themselves and others, but also the future of the city itself.

---

[30] This term is from title of Francis Barker's *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection* [1984].

[31] For a remarkably detailed examination of the anatomical quest as it related to sex and gender in the early modern period, see Thomas Laqueur's *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*.

[32] Although this study recognises the merits and critical insights of gender studies, it focusses more on the "ungendered" body -- a body prone to sin and disease -- an inclusive body of both genders.

[33] Bullein's Menippean dialogue is worth quoting in its entirety as it explains both "simple" and "mixed" body types contextually and concisely:

> *Auarus*: Are there not bodies which are called simple? I haue heard saie so.
> *Medicus:* Yes, forsooth those are the fower: the fire hote and drie, the ayre hote and moyste, the water cold and moyste, the yearth cold and drie; these are called the Elementes.
> *Antonius*: Are there not bodies called mixed? What are they?
> *Medicus*: Animalia, as man, beast, fishe, foule, and wormes: Vegetabilia, as herbe, grasse, and Trees; and Meneralia, thynges under the yearth, as mettales. In the laste matter I am verie connyng. (*DFP* 31)

[34] For an exhaustive study of the 'natural' body, see Jane O'Hara-May's *Elizabethan Dyetary of Health*, 49-68.

Within the print culture of the English Renaissance, satirists discursively fashioned and vivisected an ambiguous and contradictory body. At times, the satirical anatomy dissected a corporeal body grounded in concrete reality, a "corporall and visible creature," as John Woolton wrote in *A Newe Anatomie of whole man* [1576] (*ANA* ii). More often than not, however, the body was a discursive abject construct inhabiting a symbolic or non-empirical realm. Within the satirical anatomy these symbolic bodies became "in-between," "ambiguous" and "composite;" bodies that transcended or ignored "borders," "positions" and "rules" as Julia Kristeva argues (Kristeva 4). This discursive materiality, to use Mary Douglas's term, was "matter out of place," which reflected metaphorically the grotesque filth and disease of its urban setting (Douglas 35). Though a highly symbolic construct, "The body was the anatomist's stage upon which he outlined a complete text" (Sawday 131). Just as Vesalius was concerned with the "fabric" of the body, so too were satirical attentions focused on body matter, albeit most often discursively constructed matter

---

[35] This bodily archetype was inherited from medieval thought. See Gordon Teskey's *Allegory and Violence*, 83.

(Cunningham 147). But as he anatomised the body, so too did the satirist anatomise the soul.[36] As he waded through the entrails of his own imagination, like the legitimate anatomist, the satirist continually sought the ever-illusive diseased soul (Ibid. 268).

Although the discursive limits of plague were blurred and distorted by the early modern satirist, the grotesque possibilities of the anatomised body were equally overextended. As the satirical imagination deconstructed a discursive materiality, its normative bodily structure was abjectly deformed into a domain of "unthinkable and unliveable bodies" (Butler xi). Within the satirical anatomy, the discursive body was composed, or perhaps decomposed, of an alternative matter, not flesh and blood, but entrails and ordure, as I elucidate in Chapter Two. Within this symbolic domain, as Judith Butler and Julia Kristeva would agree, the healthy body was represented not mimetically but excrementally. By foregrounding the presence of "unjetissoned" bodily waste, the satirist hyperbolically blurred and mingled the discursive limits of life, death and excrement.

Fashioning and anatomising misshapen bodily matter was the figurative domain of the satirical poet as Ben Jonson had suggested: "Yet, common matter thou thine owne maist make, / If thou the vile, broad-troden ring forsake. / For, being a Poet, thou maist feigne, create" (Jonson *Comp Poems* 286). In these "feigned" anatomies, as Jonson intimated, poets and satirists "created vile common" bodily matter which united humanity in a most repellent homogeneity. In Jonsonian terms, the *propria materia* (*ALC* II iii 148) common to all bodies vivisected within the discursive anatomy was excrement, otherwise known as the "full"[37] body: a plenum of moral and physical dung. The corporeal shit of humanity, it seemed, had finally met the satirical shovel.

---

[36] Two representative texts of anatomising the soul would include John Woolton's *A Newe Anatomie of whole man*, as well as of his body, as of his Soule [1576] and Bartholomew Robertson's *The anatomie of a distressed soule* [1619]. Owing to its focus on the symbolic body, this thesis does not examine the role of the soul in detail. I mention the soul because it is an important part of the anatomy. An entire study could be devoted to the soul, but for all intents and purposes this project is directed at the corporeal side of the dualism.

By virtue of the grotesque nature of the anatomy and the corrupt content of the satirical body, disgust[38] prevails throughout much of the discourse of plague. Seizing upon the "moralizing capacity of disgust" (Miller *Anatomy*: 180), the satirists explored the "domains of disgust elicitors" via the sin-ridden body (Rozin, Haidt & McCauley 575). Satirical anatomists preyed upon the aversive qualities of the body in an attempt to shock their readers out of complacency. Through both exterior and interior dissections, the unapologetic satirist employed disgust as an essential component of his moral arsenal. Indeed, bodily disgust was the ideal "horror of surfeit" for the satirical anatomy (Miller *Disgust*: 169). To this end, theories of disgust, particularly the work of William Ian Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust*, play an important role in this dissertation. In the next few pages I will elaborate on what I mean by a historicism of the grotesque and what distinguishes this study from the work of theorists and historians that have informed the methodology of this dissertation.

---

[37] James Henke notes that "full" in an early modern context was a play on meaning, suggesting "full of shit." See Henke's *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays. Vol. 2,* 163.

[38] To define "disgust," I refer to Rozin, Haidt & McCauley who consider the term "a universal emotion that is strongly influenced by culture" (Rozin, Haidt & McCauley 575) and William Miller's notion of disgust as "a complex sentiment that can be lexically marked in English by expressions declaring things or actions to be repulsive, revolting, or giving rise to reactions described as revulsion and abhorrence as well as disgust" (Miller *Anatomy*: 2).

V

To historicize[39] the satirical literature of plague, that is, to contain the works, as much as possible, within the context of the ideas, conventions, and practices of its time (Fowler 115), promotes a useful starting point for understanding early modern print culture in a time of crisis. A historicist framework offers a vital method for interpreting anatomical satire. The historical methodology of my critical study contextualizes the historically appropriate background, the social and intellectual climate, and the satirical temper as it affects both the early modern conception of "pestilential visitations" and our own understanding of epidemical crisis.

The portraits of plague in early modern London invite interpretation. Without question, however, a level of critical sophistication is required for reading the deceptive histories of plague. Simply stated, "History," as Paul Hamilton argues "is not literature's background but an extension of the same plane of action on which literature makes sense" (Hamilton 164). Making sense of what, at times, appears abstract and nonsensical is problematic because the inauthentic histories of myth and symbolism distort the historical reality of plague in early modern London. As satirists responded and reacted to the historical crises brought on by plague, the "truths" of plague were more moralist rantings and cathartic fictions than empirical history. Nevertheless, the deceptive satirist remained firm in his conviction that his apocalyptic anatomies were not only revelatory but patently factual.

This study utilizes a hybrid blend of useful theoretical paradigms for reading Renaissance texts. The interpretive strategy for explicating the retrievable past is largely historicist and is further enhanced by contemporary theories of the body, theories of the grotesque, and, finally, theories of disgust. In the same spirit of other flexible historicist paradigms,[40] this study explores the partisan biases and interests of the period in which these texts were produced. A historicist framework facilitates a hermeneutic understanding of the texts, that is, the textual meanings intended for its original early modern audience (Hamilton 3). The methodology of this examination involves a textual analysis of the misanthropic rhetoric of satire and the anatomy of plague. It will also argue that rather than always being in opposition, satire and anatomy, like containment and subversion, are part of the ambiguity and contradictions of the controversy surrounding plague. The thesis will not, therefore, look for the exception to make the rule, as deconstruction and new historicism often do,[41] but will examine historical, satirical, religious and medical texts to see whether they are normative or exceptional and will try to discover how these types of texts interact to create a complex view of the plague experience. Armed with the knowledge of the past, a postmodern critical perspective can dismantle and examine the satirical regime of power, uncover its subtextual agenda, and reveal its dogmatic intentions.

---

[39] This cognate relates to the term "historicist" which refers to a more philosophical definition as articulated by Paul Edwards who defined "Historicism" as "the belief that an adequate understanding of the nature of anything and an adequate assessment of its value are to be gained by considering it in terms of the place it occupied and the role it played within a process of development." See Paul Edwards' *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy Vol. 4.*, 24.

Somewhat like historicism, the interpretive methodology of this study converges literary interpretation with historical explanation. Sharing Fredric Jameson's "transhistorical imperative" to "Always historicize" (Jameson 9), this study embarks upon what might be described as a "grotesque historicism." The textual method is historicist in the sense that it, too, relies on hermeneutics, history and anthropology to enhance and strengthen its interpretive strategy. This study is partly new historicist in the sense that it draws upon archival material, historical and literary documents, for the purpose of analyzing the dissective anecdotes of plague satire, enabling a more detailed examination of the anatomy of pestilence from multiple perspectives. Through a modified "grotesque historicism," this study refocusses some of the more valuable historicist interpretive strategies that have been developed over recent years.

---

[40] The methodology of this study draws on the insight from new historicism that adopting a single theoretical stance is insufficient for reinterpreting Renaissance culture. As Groden and Kreiswirth have noted, "art and society are interrelated, [and] cannot be answered by appealing to a single theoretical stance." See Hunter Cadzow's "New Historicism" in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*, 535.

[41] See Jonathan Hart's *Theater and World*, 221-22.

In response to anticipated resistance to the grotesque historicist method employed in this interpretive study, I am aware of and acknowledge the existence of some strong opposition to historicism, particularly to "new historicism"[42] as articulated by Stephen Greenblatt and others.[43] More recent critical works address some of the problems of the historicist method by venturing to reform "new historicism." Albert Tricomi's *Reading Tudor-Stuart Texts Through Cultural Historicism* [1996], for example, develops what Tricomi refers to as "cultural historicism" which explores "the problem of historical knowledge in relation to the production of literary history and culture" (Tricomi ix). But as informed as Tricomi's approach is, however, historicist frameworks continue to be met with resistance, likely because new historicism remains structured more upon questions and problems rather than by a systematic interpretive paradigm.[44] Regardless of reformed epithets and refashioned paradigms, however, the well-documented critical debate over historicist and new historicist approaches to Renaissance literature endures. The only consensus drawn from the historicist debate is that critics seem to agree to disagree on the highly contested methodological approach. The methodological dispute is indicative of theoretical controversy and development, and is not the primary method of, nor is the theoretical debate the focus of, this dissertation.[45]

---

[42] Much of the theoretical resistance towards new historicism, at least in Greenblatt's case, is due to the fact that new historicism isn't a theory at all, but rather, "an array of reading practices that investigate a series of issues that emerge when critics seek to chart the ways texts . . . both represent a society's behaviour patterns and perpetuate, shape, or alter that culture's dominant codes." See Hunter Cadzow's "New Historicism' in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*, 535.

[43] Without question, Stephen Greenblatt has been the foremost proponent of "new historicism." With *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* [1980]; *Shakespearean Negotiations; The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* [1988]. Other representative texts include: Claire Colebrook's *New Literary Histories: New Historicism and Contemporary Criticism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997); Jonathan Dollimore's *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993); Jonathan Goldberg's *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne , and Their Contemporaries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989); Paul Hamilton's *Historicism* (London: Routledge, 1996); Lisa Jardine's *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1983); Leah Marcus' *Childhood and Cultural Despair: A Theme and Variations in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1978); Louis Montrose's "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture" in Veeser (1989); Steven Mullaney's "Strange Things, Gross Terms, Curious Customs: The Rehearsal of Cultures in the Late Renaissance,: *Representations 3* (1983), 40-67; Stephen Orgel's *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975); Alan Sinfield's *Literature in Protestant England 1560-1660* (London: Croom Helm, 1983); and H. Aram Veeser's *The New Historicism* (London: Routledge, 1989).

The present anxiety over historical methodologies is, of course, not a new phenomenon. "Historians" of the past, as Paul Hamilton notes, "were thought to murder when they dissected, perhaps in their wish to attack a tradition or vindicate a new methodology with radical implications" (Hamilton 22). Both the satirist and this historical study use anatomical methods. Just as the anatomy was a threatening mode of enquiry during the Renaissance, so too do historicist literary methodologies seem to have a similar intimidating effect on postmodern theory and criticism. There is little appeasing historicist anxiety apart from demonstrating that perhaps ideally, the perceived theoretical butchery of this historicist approach is methodologically suited to the ignoble butchery of the satirical anatomy. Both anatomical methods, functioning within their own unique aesthetics, seek the relative or providential truths of epidemical history that co-existed alongside the suppressed empirical resonances. Like satirical myths in early modern London which resist empirical history and defy rational scientific explanation, the fictional anatomies are now approached historically while being viewed and contained as fictionalized history or grotesque realism.[46]

---

[44] See Hunter Cadzow's "New Historicism" in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*, 535.

[45] For a detailed examination of the historicist critical debate, see Clare Colebrook's *New Literary Histories: New Historicism and Contemporary Criticism* [1997] and Paul Hamilton's *Historicism* [1996].

VI

This "*not-new-historicist*" (emphasis mine) study is, however, guided by what Jean Howard describes as a historicist "willingness to explore the ways in which literature does more than reflect a context outside itself and instead constitutes one of the creative forces of history" (Kinney & Collins 16). By situating the anatomical aesthetic within its historical context, the cultural impact of this violently grotesque mode of satirical expression is made more discernible. As Claire Colebrook argues, "whatever our theory may be, the point of *reading* is not to conform our theory but to read something other," the methodology of this study intends to read "something other" into the satirical discourse of plague; not to glorify the aesthetic merits of satire, but to explore its seedier and more revulsively grotesque side (Colebrook 234-35). The theoretical method of the study is a historicism of the grotesque if you will, or an interpretive "scarborrowd ouer-reading" of culture, as the medical writer Simon Kellwaye would have described it (*ADP* 1).

Unlike more traditional scholarship, this study does not focus on the aesthetic marvels of "high" English Renaissance literature, but rather, converges on the edge of terror, what might be called the sublime barrage of early modern satire -- the "low" misanthropic underbelly of primarily non-canonical texts. The impetus for my focus on low literature is due to the fact that the antihumanist response to plague did not typically fall within canonical definitions of "good" literature. Consequently, this lack of literary refinement is likely the reason why the satirical discourse of plague has been either ignored or overlooked for so long. Yet in spite of plague satire's penchant for dark and vulgar misanthropy, the discourse contains a rich repository of masterful antihumanist writings. Plague satire was an intimidating literary medium in its time and, owing to the historicist debate, its interpretive methodology remains of interest.

---

[46] Although Bakhtin used the term "grotesque realism" to imply that reality was, as Geoffrey Harpham suggested, "all on the side of Carnival and scatological democracy," (Harpham 73) this study of the satirical anatomy inverts Bakhtin with a non-Carnivalesque milieu coupled with scatological fascism at the hands of the unforgiving early modern satirist.

Although the bulk of the texts taken up in this study are not generally regarded as "great" works of literature,[47] they are, nevertheless, important cultural artifacts of the plague debate.[48] The satirical dialogues and remembrances of plagues past embody historical[49] and grotesque realism in conjunction with inflammatory commentary which reflected and amplified the early modern material conditions of London. The human condition, for the satirist, was a dystopic one. In most cases, however, our modern historical explanations of plague do not apply to the early modern experience. Just as the early moderns were ignorant of disease transmission, we postmoderns are largely uninitiated in early modern cultural practice. A close reading of Renaissance texts from a postmodern perspective can, therefore, have problematic aspects. Maintaining a historical perspective, however, should lessen the margin of critical error substantially.

---

[47] In spite of the often crude literary presentation of these epidemics, plagues had the potential makings of high tragedy. Shakespeare recognized this possibility in *Romeo and Juliet* when he placed the doomed lovers in plague-ridden Mantua.

[48] Northrop Frye would undoubtedly agree that the bulk of these texts could be categorized as "mediocre works of art" (Frye *Anatomy*: 17). In spite of the lack of literary refinement and aesthetic merit, the satirical tracts are valuable cultural documents which provide modern readers with a unique perspective of how the notoriously conservative satyr viewed plague.

[49] In his reading of Jacob Burckhardt, Hayden White discussed "historical realism as satire." See Hayden White's *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, 230.

To comprehend the complexities of debating plague, this study adopts a rational historical approach to the irrational history of plague as it was represented through satire. The satirical anatomy of plague in early modern London provides a rich repository of grotesque fiction, with a subtly pronounced lack of emphasis on what we today would refer to as empirical truth. Just as Friedrich Nietzsche warned in *The Will to Power* [1888], that "History always enunciates new truths" (Tripp 118), so too were the early modern satirists masters at manufacturing and embellishing the disgusting reality of human tragedy, within what Jonas Barish describes as "the grimmer realm of history" (Barish 10). With Nietzsche's dictum and the deceptive nature of the satirist in mind, I analyze in this study the suspicious "historical truths" of plague satire. Having disentangled the facts of plague from its dissective fictions, this method separates the providential from the empirical, the moral from the material, and the historical from the imaginary.

The satirical truths as expounded by moralizing writers are scrutinized in detailed close readings. To facilitate our understanding as to what inspired satirists to metamorphose and anatomise the microcosm and macrocosm to such grotesque Neoplatonic extremes, this dissertation historicizes the symbolic and the material conditions of early modern London. By setting out the religious and ideological contexts and the social debates regarding plague in the early modern period, my analysis should make the grotesque mirroring of the culture more decipherable. As this study will demonstrate, the "shameles Satyrist"[50] (Marston *Poems* 84) and his "pasquilling libels & satires" were rarely mimetic (*AM Pt 1 Sec 2*: 289). Satirical plague tracts were more about distorting history, disease, and anatomy than recording the verisimilitude of epidemic. Thomas Elyot's *Gouernour* [1531], is a representative work because it placed "physiology, anatomy, [and] all descriptive science," as well as "most of the Old Testament and the Acts" within "the scope of history" (Shepherd "Introduction" *AAP*: 40). For the early modern satirists, sacred history and natural history became fused into human history: an apocalyptical history of sin, misery, suffering and death. Factual truth was pushed aside for moral truth within this urban *contemptus mundi*. Whereas Renaissance humanism was based on knowledge of the classical past, the misanthropic antihumanism employed by the anatomising satirist was modeled largely upon the pestilential myths of biblical typologies. If anything, the distortion and amplification of epidemic revealed a more providential than empirical, a more retributive, than realist history of plague in an early modern urban context, as the "historical imagination[s]" of pious writers represented what they deemed a doomed and degenerate society (White 45).

---

[50] This study uses the terms "satyr," "satyr-anatomist" and "satirist" interchangably when referring to writers dissecting plague in the satirical mode

The history of plague was more about moralist propaganda than empirical reality as Sir Philip Sidney reiterated in *An Apology for Poetry* [1595]. "Histories greatest authorities are built upon the notable foundation of hearsay" (*AAP* 105). Like poetry, early modern satire blurred the distinction between art and history. Again, as Sidney emphasized, "neither philosopher nor historiographer could at the first have entered into the gates of popular judgments, if they had not taken a great passport of Poetry" -- authors were creators of fictitious histories (Ibid. 97). Through the "zodiac of his own wit" (Ibid. 100), the plague satirist reinterpreted epidemic as mainly a providentialist experience, and unlike Sidney, made no apologies for it.

As critics of our own age have discovered, even Renaissance theory and criticism – whether Sir Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poetry* [1595], Stephen Gosson's *School of Abuse* [1579], or Sir Francis Bacon's *The Advancement of Learning* [1605] – fail to offer a totalizing historical or literary overview of the early modern period. Indeed, what often remains is a "notoriously slippery base for generalization,"[51] and perhaps this is as good as it gets. But by acknowledging and being consciously aware of the critical shortcomings of historicizing satire,[52] and by engaging what Paul Hamilton describes as "historicist reflexivity," this study should reduce historical erroneousness by relying upon the insightful research of cultural historians well-versed in the both the Renaissance and epidemic disease (Hamilton 169).[53] Contextual Renaissance criticism is intrinsically beneficial for examining plague satire and the problems of history, particularly the satirical literature inspired by epidemic.

VII

While Sir Francis Bacon was interested in literature and history, he has not been considered primarily a literary critic or historian, nevertheless, his methodology for interpreting literary texts was particularly visionary and has proved useful for the purposes of this study. In *The Advancement of Learning, Book One*, for example, Bacon explained the problem of history this way:

> The images of men's wits and knowledge remain in books, exempted from the wrong of time, and capable of perpetual renovation. Neither are they fitly

---

[51] See Gordon Braden's "Renaissance Theory and Criticism" in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*, 612.

[52] As Roger Fowler reminded us: "Historicism . . . cannot provide us with an absolute or objective measure of literary meaning or value. It is not a substitute for the act of intelligent imagination which we call criticism; but it is, properly used, one of the critic's most valuable tools" (Fowler 116).

[53] Some of the key historical works used to enhance this study include: Andrew Cunningham's *The Anatomical Renaissance: The Resurrection of the Anatomical Projects of the Ancients* [1997]; Boris Ford's *Seventeenth Century Britain: The Cambridge Cultural History Vol. 4* [1992]; John Guy's *Tudor England* [1988]; Arien Mack's *In Time of Plague: The History and Social Consequences of Lethal Epidemic Disease* [1991]; Laurence Manley's *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* [1995]; William McNeill's *Plagues and Peoples* [1976]; Michael Neill's *Issues of Death: Mortality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy* [1997]; Jonathan Sawday's *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* Geddes Smith's *Plague On Us* [1941]; and Paul Slack' s *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* [1990].

> to be called images, because they generate still, and cast their seeds in the minds of others, provoking and causing infinite actions and opinions in succeeding ages. (Bacon *Maj Wks*: 168)

In a Baconianesque fashion, the role of historicism in this study also concerns the "perpetual renovation" of the satirical literature of plague. As Paul Hamilton points out, "History has become textual. We never encounter the real thing, only the images and figurations by which it is repeatedly parodied" (Hamilton 104). As Bacon pointed out, though separated by history, succeeding ages which would include our own postmodern period, should learn from the wit and knowledge of the past. In this spirit, taking advantage of the contextual information available at our disposal will undoubtedly help us to reconstruct a fuller account of the ideologies of plague and the uncompromising and intolerant satirical morality of early modern culture in times of crisis.

While Bacon was harshly critical of satire (Bacon *Maj Wks*: 253), he could not deny that the satirist was in the right place at the "wrong of time." And though historicizing Renaissance texts might produce the "infinite opinions" Bacon spoke of, when engaged properly, historicism -- a methodological approach engaged in explanation and evaluation -- can ultimately cultivate a more accurate interpretation of historical texts.[54] Indeed, historical evidence and understanding can only enhance the accuracy of literary interpretation of early modern literature. In salvaging these long-ignored texts, however, this study remains consciously and critically aware of historicism's merits and limitations.

In an attempt to combat both the disease and the sin that fostered plague, early modern satirists reinvented anatomy on their own discursive terms. The physician dissecting plague, like "Anatomies and other spectacles," "hardened" the already embittered satirist (Earle 16). As they employed a hybrid blend of physiology and the religious philosophies of the day, satirists dissected the entire plague experience: its impact on the physical, the moral and the spiritual bodies of London. To help unravel the complex intricacies of these "virtual" dissections, this thesis incorporates legitimate anatomy and natural philosophy as a kind of empirical and a contextual barometer from which to glean the symbolic accounts of the satirical anatomy.

---

[54] See Paul Edwards' *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Vol. 4*, 24.

It is necessary at this point to establish a poetics, or working definition, of plague satire. By fleshing out the role the satirical anatomy played in the discursive constructions of the body and disease within early modern culture in time of epidemic, this study will be able to re-dissect the uninfected and infected bodies of plague-infested London.

VIII

The satirical anatomy was a symbolic process that enabled satirists to vent their misanthropic spleens upon what they considered to be a morally deviant culture. Charged with misanthropic anger, the satirical anatomy was, as William Engel suggests, an outlet for writers who intended to confuse "the registers of the symbolic and the real" (Engel 147). Apart from conflating the fantastic and the actual, the anatomy was an emotionally charged endeavour, as George Wither put forth in *Abuses stript, and whipt* [1613]. According to Wither, the anatomy was an emotional release for satirists "That write in Anger, or malicious spleen" (*ASW* A11). John Marston and others would also use that "malcontented" and "spleenful breath"

(*MAL* I vii 10). But satire was not the exclusive domain of the satirist. On the contrary, even the more optimistic and objective legitimate anatomist frequently descended into the satirical realm, complimenting his scholarly commentary with moralistic overtones[55] and imputing sin as the cause of disease. Although widely divergent in method, both anatomical camps often derived the same conclusion: plague was a condign punishment inflicted by an angry God.

In spite of the practical factionalism between legitimate anatomy and the satirical anatomy, for satirist and anatomist alike, the written or recorded anatomy was a "rhetorical process," typically defined in Renaissance rhetoric books as *distributio* or the "breaking down of a large subject into its various parts for close examination."[56] As the physician and anatomist William Harvey put it in *Lectures on the Whole of Anatomy* [1616], "anatomy [was] concerned with division" (*ALH* 5). But whereas Harvey's empirical anatomy[57] was dissecting a divine masterpiece – humanity – the satirist vivisected a grotesque creature: the non-corporeal microcosm. Under the aegis of the anatomy, symbolic and legitimate dissections abounded in both Elizabethan and Jacobean print cultures. George Wither described the fierce competition between satirical tracts and legitimate medical tracts[58] as a dog-eat-dog

---

[55] In *The Marrow of Physicke, Or a learned Discourse of the parts of a mans Body*, for example, Thomas Brugis argued that "Evill conformity is a fault of the organick parts, and is called a disease in number, as when some thing abounds" (Brugis 72-3). Like other anatomists, Brugis lays blame for disease on an intrinsically evil flesh.

[56] Although Donker and Muldrow confine their rather polite definition of "anatomy" to "abuse'," "love," "wit," "religion" and "cozenage," this study examines the more impolite, the violent and bloody symbolic anatomies of the satyr-anatomists. See Marjorie Donker and George M. Muldrow's *Dictionary of Literary-Rhetorical Convention of the English Renaissance*, 9.

[57] William Harvey defined anatomy as "that branch of learning which teaches and actions the parts of the body by ocular inspection and by dissection." Harvey divided anatomy into five main divisions: "the general account of each part; its use, action and usefulness for what; discussion of the problems arising from the opinions of authorities; manual skill or dexterity in dissection; and the preparation of the embalmed body." See *The Anatomical Lectures of William Harvey*, 5.

[58] In addition to the wealth of published satires, Paul Slack has noted that throughout "Elizabeth's reign an average of three or four medical books came out each year, and they were especially numerous whenever epidemics occurred." See Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 3.

"troupe of bony, pickt *Anatomies*" (*ASW* 253). Using "anatomy" as their guiding metaphor, anatomists performed post-mortems while satirists conducted their speculative dissections of plague-infested London. While the anatomist was somewhat more tempered and philosophical in his observations, the satirist dissecting plague was apparently more given to ***reductio absurdum***.

As the title and content of Nashe's railing pamphlet of 1589, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, demonstrated, the satyr-anatomists often took the anatomy to absurd lengths. In this satirical tract, Nashe dissected a corrupt early modern London with a proto-existentialist methodology: "beeing about to anatomize Absurditie," wrote Nashe, "[I] am vrged to take a view of sundry mens vanitie, a suruey of their follie, [and] a briefe of their barbarisme" (Nashe *Wks I*: 9). The bulk of the satirical anatomies could be considered absurd anatomies wherein authors questioned and debated the "vnsauery duncery" of each other's perspectives on plague and other topical issues of social importance (Ibid. 9). In keeping with his absurdist stance, Nashe went so far as to discredit the anatomical process itself. Envisioning the task as not only inherently aversive and ultimately contaminating, Nashe asked: "what should I spend my yncke, waste my paper, stub my penne, in painting forth theyr [Londoners] vgly imperfections, and peruerse peeuishnesse" (Ibid. 16). Such speculative detractions, of course, never prevented Nashe or any of his slurring cohorts from performing satirical vivisections. If nothing else, the crude pathos of Nashe's satirical complaint made for entertaining reading.

Though often absurdly plotless,[59] satirical anatomies weren't so much about story as they were about the incident or social impact of epidemic. The satirist's didactic purpose was to construct and deconstruct a dystopian urban setting populated by an aversive array of sinners. Arguing by bad example, as Dekker did in *The Rauens Almanacke* [1609], the satirist attacked the manifold sins and sinners of London, "like a theefe begd for an Anatomy in Surgeons Hall . . . slashing and slycing, and quartering and cutting him vp" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks* 180). In order to attack the source the satirist considered responsible for plague – namely vice and sin – the satirist needed to dissect the culture in grotesque detail,[60] within increasingly grotesque anatomical distortions which presumably exposed "mans base imbecillity," as the author of *The Times Whistle* [1615] put it (R.C. 92).

---

[59] Alvin Kernan has observed satire's "absence of plot" in detail in his *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*, 30.

Rarely short on hubris, early modern satirical anatomists considered themselves self-appointed moral guardians, writing not only to entertain but to inform and morally correct by exposing the vice and collective sin which brought plague upon Elizabethan and Jacobean London. With an emphasis on what Frye defines as "low norm satire,"[61] plague satire was often synonymous in tone and perspective with invective preaching. Most English writers on plague desired to express the pious truth and morality of plague as they conceived of it: pestilence as divine retribution. In keeping with their dogmatic convictions of what Jonson referred to as this "barren and infected age," these satirical tracts were distorted or embellished accounts of the ravages of plague that were regularly passed off as mimetic or realistic accounts which can be defined as grotesque realism (*EMI* V iii 322). If anything, historical verisimilitude was rarely a mimetic concern for the "hyperbolicall" and revisionist satirical writer. As Frye reminds us in *Anatomy of Criticism*, "In satire observation is still primary, but as the observed phenomena move from the sinister to the grotesque, they grow more illusory and unsubstantial" (Frye *Anatomy*: 298). As the satirical anatomy became more fantastical, authorial observations usually shifted from the corruptly sinister to the abjectly grotesque. By foregrounding the foul unpleasantries of urban life in disease-ridden London, writers exposed not only the physical filth of the city but its moral filth as well. Taking satire to aversive extremes, writers manufactured and anatomised a grotesque city by conveying their disdain through bodily and cultural disgust.

---

[60] Although Alvin Kernan does not explicitly use the metaphor "anatomy," he has described the satirical process as a method of the use of construction and destruction. See Kernan's *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*, 24.

[61] Northrop Frye describes "low norm satire" as a mode which assumed a macrocosm "full of anomalies, injustices, and crimes, and yet is permanent and undisplacable;" a satirical setting indicative of the plague experience. See *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, 226.

Apart from the obvious moral implications raised in these satirical elucidations, this rather lethal combination of satire and anatomy gave genesis to a threatening series of cultural dissections in prose, verse and drama. To help encapsulate this obsessive quest for comprehending the grotesque "mysteries" of the human body in times of social and spiritual crises, Jonathan Sawday aptly refers to the period as the "culture of dissection" (Sawday 4), while Andrew Cunningham offers the epithet "anatomical Renaissance" (Cunningham 3). As Sawday and Cunningham have each argued, the propensity to anatomize in this period is well-represented in the print culture. But where most critics and historians have focused on medical anatomists, I am most concerned with the satirical anatomists[62] in the literature of plague. Through the metaphor of the anatomy, the authors in this study reformed satire for their own unique grotesque purposes. This modal shift was not so much a reinvention of satire as a redefinition and resetting of the discursive limits of satire.

Within these moralizing and degrading accounts of a city under siege, tragedy and satire were inextricably linked in the melancholy travesties of plague. The plague satires explored in this study concern the tragic satirical mode of the satyr-anatomists of Elizabethan and Jacobean England whose damning social invectives were frequently rude, unmannerly and often disgusting. To extrude what writers considered to be the sinful sources of plague, the satirical agenda was an unveiled attempt to deliver London from plague. To effect this social and moral change, however, satirists employed what Geoffrey Harpham calls "Dante's grid,"[63] the grotesque metamorphosis of London and its inhabitants via the anatomy. To put it simply, to reform London, the satirist had to deform London. By defamiliarizing both the individual and the collective body of the city in print, the satirist forged a terrified and terrifying sublime from the epidemic wasting the city; an immoral exemplar to shake Londoners out of their sinful habits.[64]

---

[62] This study does not exclude medical writers such a Vicary, Crooke, Herring, Banister, Lodge and others who took the frequent liberties to descend into the satirical mode in their own medical anatomies.

By virtue of the expansive range of satirical styles examined in this study, this dissertation resists imposing a strict definition of satire and argues instead that the tragic satire of plague is more of a satiric mode than a strictly defined genre. In a Bakhtinian sense, this study considers the satirical genre neither as "sets of conventions nor hierarchies of devices but as ways of seeing the world:"[65] a grotesque gaze that defies conventional borders. By using the modal insights,[66] derived from Alvin Kernan's detailed analysis of Elizabethan critical theories of satire, in *The Cankered Muse*, this thesis will both extend and limit his methodology of the tragic satirical mode by applying Kernan's concepts solely to the literature of plague and the grotesque body. Without imposing the formal strictures which generally define "satire," therefore, this study will not limit itself to formal or indirect satire, Juvenalian, Horatian or Menippean, for that matter, but will include all appropriate types of tragic satire operating in works that might likely be classified as non-satirical in structure or in form.[67]

---

[63] See Geoffrey Harpham's *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature*, 12.

[64] Nicholas Breton, for example, was representative of his satirical contemporaries when he attacked the sin and corruption of a morally "filthie" city in his "Inuectiue against the Wicked of the Worlde" (Breton *Wks. I*: 5).

[65] See Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson's "Bakhtin" in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*, 66.

[66] See Alvin Kernan's *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*, 54-63.

What unifies the works chosen for this study is that most contain sustained satirical attacks directed against a plague-ridden society.[68] The prose, poetry, drama, and religious and medical tractates taken up by this study are surveyed for their anatomical qualities. Most of the texts examined are works that, as Northop Frye would suggest, "have ignored the models but have preserved the tone and attitude of satire" (Frye 1977: 323). Indeed, the bulk of the texts explored here concerns pamphlet literature that would likely not fall under the strict generic epithet "satire." If anything, these early modern remembrances of plagues past more resemble satirical pastiches, wherein incidents were pieced together within generic borders which were regularly bent, broken and grotesquely stitched together.

Within works where satire is not sustained, there are, as I will argue, dour satirical moments where writers attack and denounce the subject and subjects of plague. In this sense, then, this study will explore how satire occurred as an incidental element[69] (through both brief satirical moments and extended satirical engagements with plague), rather than how satire functioned as a pure generic category. Whether direct or indirect satire, however, this study is not so much concerned with the structure or the form of the discourse but, rather, the grotesque and didactic subject matter of the text. This study's primary purpose is to survey the satirical anatomist's textual fashioning and disfiguring anatomy of bodies and disease as conveyed through the "tone" and "attitude" of satire. The work's generic configuration is, therefore, of lesser consequence because this is a study of the satyr and satiric disgust in the discursive anatomy of pestilence.

---

[67] Arguably, the textual focus of this dissertation concerns "formal" or "direct" satire in a quasi-Juvenalian vein, but also includes works which border on "indirect" satire in a Menippean mode, or as Northrop Frye has referred to it as the "anatomy" (Frye *Anatomy*: 308-12).

[68] Under the rubric "plague literature" I include works in a "satiric mode" which directly address plague, allude to plague or attack the sins and vices the early moderns assumed brought plague upon London.

[69] M.H. Abrams makes this distinction in his theory of satire for works that do not fall under the general rubric or formal genre of satire. See M.H Abrams' *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 166.

As I have already suggested, few of the "anatomies" this study examines can be considered great works of art, but then satire is not generally regarded as the highest form of literature. Just as anatomy was once viewed as a dangerously threatening "lower" form of medical inquiry, so too did the satirical anatomy of plague threaten the literary aesthetic by lowering the standards of decorum; what George Chapman described in *All Fools* [1599] as "rank, stinking satire" (*AF* V ii 46). As Chapman indicated, it seemed only a satirical aesthetic could withstand a scatological landscape, suppurating sores and the cadaverous realism of mass mortality. Much of the literature of plague possessed what Gilbert Highet describes as the essential "characteristics of satire": the topicality of epidemic, an assertive realism (despite exaggeration and distortion), the power to shock and disgust; an informal tone; and the potential for humour (albeit grotesque).[70] While few writers could capture the essence of plague-infested London, exemplary satirists like the doubting Thomas's Nashe and Dekker had little difficulty in describing, denouncing, decrying and ultimately anatomising the rigours of plague -- flogging their grim news in detailed invective that the reader likely often did not want to, but fully expected to hear.

In response to epidemical conditions, London's anatomising satirists were not particularly congenial to tragic themes such as plague, but to their credit, and as Frye argues, neither was one of their principal sources of inspiration: the Bible.[71] Using scriptural sources as their "divine" authority, the satirists created persecution texts of their own condemning imaginations. The satirical character was known for his propensity to shame and blame; to locate a guilty party – a scapegoat or *pharmakos* in fact – for London's recurring epidemics, and the discourse of plague reaffirms this accusatory position.[72] All Londoners were potential sacrificial victims because all were contaminated in a Christian sense through sin,[73] as the title and text of Edmund Cobbes' *The Parable of the Vncleane Spirit* [1633] suggested. The collective sin of London, the satirist maintained, was what brought plague upon the city: a disease that Anthony Anderson, among many others, described as "a deserued Plague" (Anderson i). As he manufactured a city out of what William Miller refers to as "metaphors of reciprocity"[74] – such as the highly popular "dreadful visitation"[75] – the satirist intended to expose the contaminating nature of thoughtless folly and to set London on a correct moral path via the deforming anatomy. By dissecting what Joseph Hall portrayed as the "mis-ordred world, and lawlesse times," the satirist hoped to restore order – Christian order to London (Hall *Coll Poems* 12).

---

[70] See Gilbert Highet's *The Anatomy of Satire*, 5.
[71] See Northrop Frye's, *The Great Code*, 181.

IX

While drawing on historical and theoretical perspectives on the literature of plague, I have also examined a wide array of primary texts, which have through induction contributed to this study. This dissertation was inspired by the pain of infection and torturous dissection of symbolic bodies that I continued to uncover in my close readings of the primary material. The further I read into the primary materials, the more I found the literature of plague disturbing and fascinating. It became increasingly clear that there was a subversive perversity uniting these moralising writers. For satirists, lethal epidemic disease was an *idée fixe*, an obsessive preconception that provided a foundation for their moralising rants and an opportunity to transcend decorum by setting new standards of invective, taking satire to its repellent limits through an argot of disgust. Despite their authoritative rants, the satirical authors included in this study seemed to transcend reproach by indulging in the grotesque fantasies of the anatomy. The apportioning of blame for plague, the contempt for the bodies (both infected and uninfected), the bodily violence and the sheer grotesqueness, disgust[76] and abjection of the satirical anatomies all continued to stimulate my interpretive readings. Ultimately, it was the invective violence of satire and the horrors and surfeit of epidemic which inspired the reasoning and framework for this thesis.

---

[72] From the satirist's perspective, sin was omnipresent, and therefore, the *pharmakos* of plague-ridden London, inhabited every corner of the filthy city. Though the poorest areas were hit the hardest, the entire city was affected by plague, either directly or indirectly.

[73] See Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, 148-49; and René Girard's *The Scapegoat*, 122.

[74] William Ian Miller has described how "indignation is organized around" within what he referred to as "metaphors of reciprocity." Miller's reciprocal metaphor could apply appropriately to plague because the metaphorical "debit and credit, of owing and paying back" is analogous to the divine exchange between sin and retributive punishment such as plague. See Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust*, 36.

[75] Many writers employ the "visitation" metaphor. Two ideal examples include William Cupper's *Certaine Sermons Concerning Gods Late visitation in the cite of London and other parts of the land, teaching all men to make vse thereof, that meane to profit by Gods fatherly chastisements* [1592] and Thomas Fuller's *A Sermon Intended for Pavl's Crosse, But Preached in the Chvrch of St. Pavl's. Upon the late Decrease and withdrawing of Gods heavie Visitation of the Pestilence from the said Citie* [1626].

This dissertation is organised into four chapters that articulate the context, purpose, and meaning of anatomical satire in early modern London. Working through the metaphor of the anatomy, satirical writers symbolically vivisected London and its inhabitants in an attempt to define, expose, and ultimately eliminate the moral causes of plague through shame and humiliation. The punitive aesthetic of the anatomy was condemning and accusatory and all bodies, both sick and healthy, were suspected of breeding the sins that engendered plague.

Chapter One establishes what the satirical anatomy meant in an early modern context. What was most distinctive about these texts was the use of satire in the tragedy of epidemic.[77] Within plague satire, as I understand it, the structures of experience became more imagined than real, more grotesque than factual. As Northrop Frye suggests, "Both tragedy and satire take us into a hell of narrowing circles, a blasted world of repulsiveness and idiocy, a world without pity and without hope": this study takes a similar critical path of discovery within a pestilential context (Frye 1977: 339). In the early modern period, satirists transformed the melancholy and tragic realism of epidemic into the realm of the grotesque and the domain of biblical horror. Satirical writers exploiting plague as their moral theme or setting rarely provided that Barthesean "pleasure of the text" that we postmoderns have come to expect. Instead, these ranting authors reinforced the pains and miseries of epidemic; invoking not *plaisir* or *jouissance* but *Angst* and *Weltschmerz* of often near-Sadean proportions.

---

[76] A graduate course on Postmodernism and numerous discussions with Robert Wilson on disgust were especially conducive to my understanding of disgust in literature. For a visceral and engaging prologemenon to disgust, see Robert Wilson's "Introduction," in "The Disgust Issue," *Mattoid* 48, 1994.

Chapter Two explores the mythical origins of the uninfected, abject body: an excremental ontology that was largely fashioned out of embellished biblical typologies. In plague time, even the healthy body was the target of what John Marston called the "abiect scorne" of the satirist (*SOV* 23). This section demonstrates how satirists used not only religion but natural philosophy and Neoplatonism to deform and muddy the grotesque body, reestablishing the corporeal body as a defiling mass: a vessel of dung. Throughout the discourse of the anatomy, the satirist maintained that the healthy body was a grotesque misnomer. Indeed, the anatomy asserted that bodily matter was corruption incarnate: a dystopian body for a dystopian culture. As Helkiah Crooke defined it, even the healthy body, like its infectious counterpart, was a "liuing body of death" -- a paradoxical construct -- a grotesque configuration of death and dirt that mirrored its filthy macrocosm: plague-infested London (*MCM* 61).

---

[77] As I have already mentioned, Northrop Frye's work on satire and the anatomy from the *Anatomy of Criticism* [1957] was instrumental in helping me derive the method of this thesis. At the suggestion of Jonathan Hart, I reexamined *Anatomy of Criticism* [1957] and *The Great Code* [1982] which reshaped the approach to this dissertation.

Chapter Three examines how the abject nature of the plague body was phobically reinforced. Through the anatomy, the infected body was reduced to a grotesque taxonomy of suppurating sores: a deformed body unquestionably punished through what the satirist defined as retributive justice. In an invective of disgust plague sufferers were simultaneously abjected and condemned to inhabit "bodies" that were "stinking dungeons for diseases to dwell in," as Thomas Nashe asserted (Nashe *Wks II*: 154). Ultimately, this chapter explains how this discharging vessel of infection was a source of fear and loathing, and how the satirist reinscribed the diseased body's contaminating presence by foregrounding its grotesque fabric and its infectious discharges. The phobic anxieties and the rhetoric of horror articulates how the scapegoating of the infected was executed in the most abject of fashions, reinforcing the general *angst* of epidemic in the process.

Chapter Four provides a detailed examination of the most threatening dimension of the plague body: its miasmatic effluents. Using "noyse" or stench as their guides for anatomising and negotiating plague, the satirists constructed and catalogued the hysteria of smells which emanated from the diseased body. Among the sins held in contempt for promoting divine visitations, even the proto-Malthusian essence of malodorous poverty was indicted for breeding pestilence. Whether rich or poor, however, the infected body's phobic presence was consistently stenchful. By exploring the phobic volatility of plague-related stinks contained within the toxic interplay of the anatomy, this chapter will illustrate exactly how olfactoral and moral disgust worked together to both manufacture and condemn the abject "noyse" of the infected body.

Having established a frame of reference, a methodology and a poetics for this study, it is now possible to move forward into the visceral yet discursive flesh of the satirical anatomy.

Chapter One
The Satirical Anatomy of Early Modern London

Anatomia Comparata: Satire versus Natural Philosophy

As the Introduction articulated, the anatomy of plague and the plague-infested body was predominately an allegorical dissection: not a medical or natural philosophical dismemberment but moreso a spiritual vivisection. Within the anatomy the infected body became an allegorical site for moral commentary: an extended metaphor for all that was corrupt and evil. The natural phenomenon of infection was repeatedly allegorized through the conservative moralizings of London satirists. In this sense, plague was both historical and moral allegory -- a widespread killer let loose within London's walls -- reinscribed in the early modern imagination through biblical prophecies and the heavy-handed apocalyptic verisimilitude of dogmatic satirists.

Within the print culture early modern London played host to competing anatomies: the symbolic or satirical vivisection and the dissective endeavours of natural philosophy.[1] The comparative anatomies of satirical vivisection and human dissection offered profound affinities and departures because they made ideal comparisons as both methodologies worked toward the same end: a deeper understanding of the human body and a profound desire to eliminate disease.[2] Both anatomical camps dissect but in radically different fashions: scalpel versus pen; dissection versus vivisection; realism versus fantasy; medical inquiry versus allegory; healthy bodies versus infected bodies; and corporeal bodies versus symbolic bodies. As Northrop Frye uses the metaphorical "anatomy" to describe the link between ancient and more modern Menippean satire, this "critical" anatomy intends to dissect the Renaissance of grotesque satire in plague-infested early modern London (Frye *Anatomy* 311-12). The focus of this section is satirical anatomy; however, analogous links to physical anatomy are introduced when appropriate and necessary. Both intellectual pursuits often complemented one another because both were intensely Christian enterprises.[3] Legitimate anatomy operating under the rubric "natural philosophy"[4] had an explicitly spiritual purpose, and like satire, a distinct moral commentary. As Vivian Nutton suggests, even the influential friend and adviser of Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, "was convinced that both moral philosophy and natural philosophy were essential for the education of the Christian; hence – anatomy was too important to be left solely to the physicians."[5]

---

[1] It is important at this point to establish the distinction between "natural philosophy" and "modern science." This study follows Andrew Cunningham and Perry Williams' notion

> that while natural philosophy was itself indeed an investigation of the natural world, which was sometimes empirical and sometimes even experimental, yet it was nevertheless one which was radically different from science in the modern sense. . . For the whole point of natural philosophy was to look at nature and the world *as created by God*, and as thus capable of being understood as embodying God's powers and purposes and of being used to say something about them. (Cunningham and Williams 421)

The term "natural philosophy," for the purposes of this dissertation, therefore, refers to "an investigation of the natural world created by God" and not empirical "science" devoid of divinity. Although texts from the fifteenth century, such as Lanfranc's *Chirurgerie* [c 1400], spoke of "siurgie" as "a medicinal science" (*OED* CD ROM), "medicinal science" for the early moderns was more grounded on spirituality than pure empiricism.

The crisis of plague forced the satirist to examine not only social ills but the individual populace as well. He did this by looking inwards for a scapegoat, sometimes looking within himself but mostly gazing at the sinful interiors of others. The satirical anatomist was well-versed in Christian tradition and while he condemned bodies, he predictably worshipped God above all else. Indeed, the satirist had God on his side as he opened the body with a spiritual scalpel, excoriating the vile divine secrets which eluded medical anatomists. While it may seem somewhat surprising to us, satirical-based anatomies appeared somehow more credible for the more orthodox reader: after all, God possessed the answers to the mysteries of existence, not the lowly surgeon or naive and over-reaching anatomist.

---

[2] In *Christes Teares Ouer Ierusalem* [1593], Nashe expressed the moral side of comprehending infection, informing his readers that to "Vnderstande the nature of thy disease . . . is the first steppe to recouery" (Nashe *Wks II:* 55).

[3] Andrew Cunningham has stressed the point that even "natural philosophy" – the medical enquiry of the Renaissance – was largely a religious quest. See Cunningham's *The Anatomical Renaissance*, 206.

[4] According to Robert G. Frank, "Medicine," in the seventeenth century, "was seen as closely related to natural philosophy." See Frank's "Medicine" in *The History of the University of Oxford Vol IV*, 558.

[5] See Vivian Nutton's essay "Wittenberg Anatomy" in *Medicine and the Reformation*, 23.

Although Robert Copland in *Guydon's Quest Cyrugyrie* [1541] maintained "The scyence of the Nathomy is nedeful and necessarye to the Cyrurgyen" (*OED* CD ROM), the dissective "scyence"[6] employed by the legitimate anatomist was, according to the satirical writer, often misguided and arrogant. Arguably, both anatomical methods were crude or passive "pathologie[s]"[7] of sorts.[8] For under that fleshy façade lay "ryot, lust, and fleshy seeming sweetnes," encased within a deceptive body which, as John Marston declared, only appeared to be "vnder the shade of greatnes" (*SOV* 67). Through a series of symbolic anatomies the early modern satirists vivisected London in an attempt to expose its "foule" inherent corruptness. The city suffered not only from plague but from an allegorical anatomy of the urban centre and its citizens. Within the sphere of these discursive anatomies, satirists had revoked the sacred status of the body, recategorizing the fragmented body with a distinctly abject tenor.

---

[6] I use the terms "scyence," "*scientia*," and "natural philosphy" interchangably in this study to denote not "modern science," but a pre-scientific systematic knowledge of observation employed by both physicians and anatomists in early modern London.

[7] From the late-sixteenth century onward, the French term "pathologie" began to circulate in early modern dictionaries and medical discourse. In *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* [1611], the lexicographer, Randle Cotgrave, for example, defined "Pathologie" as "That part of Physicke which intreats the causes, qualities, and differences of diseases" (Cotgrave P20). Similarly, A.M, in his translation of *Guillemeau's French Chirugerie* [1597] recorded "*Pathologia* treatethe of the cause and occasione of the sicknesses" (OED CD ROM). For the early moderns, then, "pathology" was more a treatment of disease than a physiological understanding of sickness and infection, as the term suggests in a modern scientific sense.

[8] As Robert J. Frank argues, "Active pathological inquiry began only after [the mid-seventeenth] century" See Frank's "Medicine" in *The History of the University of Oxford Vol IV*, 547.

The series of condemning anatomies examined in this chapter were part of the culture's larger phobic reaction to plague. In manufacturing and dismembering this grotesque *pastiche*, the satirist claimed, as this section will demonstrate, to mirror the abject essence of early modern culture. This chapter is set out in seven parts. The opening section examines the satirical appropriation of the anatomical method -- the disciplinary violence of the anatomy's moralist *modus operandi*. In the second section, the fraudulent empiricism of the anatomy is analyzed to expose how the satyr-anatomist manufactured a series of absurd and unorthodox precepts which undermined the sacred status of the body through an abject sublimity. In the third section this study probes the moral gore of the discursive anatomy that transformed London into a vast allegorical anatomy theatre -- not for medical inquiry -- but for moral analysis and censure. The micro/macro partitioning nature of the anatomy which attacked both the individual and the society-at-large through the pessimistic trope of Neoplatonism is the central concern of the fourth section. Satirical distortion of the figurative and the factual within a largely allegorical mode, is the focus of the fifth section, which examines the dangerous moral truths conveyed through the invective ruminations of the anatomy. In the sixth section a series of symbolic vivisections that are of particular relevance to this study are investigated because they unveil the malevolent moral agenda of the "quick" anatomy: its sadism and its savagery. The seventh and final section explicates the ritual and sadistically violent dismemberment executed within a discursive domain through what bordered on, at times, a brutish and disciplinary masochism of "naked" misanthropy. In addition to his innovative and visionary anatomical methods, the satyr-anatomist appropriated the dissective metaphors of the past and the present to exact discipline and vengeance on the immoral body. The result was an unrefined and often absurd, yet hybrid combination of anatomy and disgust -- a gross anatomy -- of art and "scyence," to use Robert Copland's term.[9]

Gross Anatomy : The Sadistic Sublime

One of the more important empirical pursuits of the early modern era which directly influenced both art and natural philosophy was anatomy.[10] Anatomical study was not strictly limited to the natural philosophical realm as it had a prominent role in both the art and literature of the Renaissance.[11] While a number of prominent names stand out in the history of anatomy, Andreas Vesalius is still considered the "architect of the new anatomy"[12] and the revivalist of *autopsia*, the "personal experience of dissection."[13] When he published *De Humani Corporis Fabrica* in 1543, it was the most complete and accurate illustrated treatise on anatomy of its time. With the *Fabrica*, Vesalius had reinvented anatomy. A "hands on" anatomist, Vesalius' morphology was the most precise and perhaps the most humanist to date. Anatomy was one of the older branches of medicine. During the Renaissance, physicians and anatomists rediscovered the ancient works of Hippocrates, Galen, and Aristotle, but with the rebirth of anatomy, the anatomical findings of the early moderns would eventually undermine many ancient observations. As Vesalius would discover, most ancients based their anatomical writings on the dissection and vivisection of animals, having never actually opened human bodies. It was during the early modern period that anatomical errors, particularly of Galen, would be corrected by the "hands-on" anatomical approach of the Renaissance anatomists. By publicizing the body interior through visual "anatomical rhetoric" (Teskey 84), as opposed to the scriptural dogma of the satirist, Vesalius, and da Vinci, Michaelangelo, and Pisano before him, generated what Gordon Teskey describes as a "corporeal apocalypse" (Ibid. 84), perhaps one of the greatest intellectual revelations of the Renaissance.

---

[9] As Andrew Cunningham and Perry Williams reiterate, while "ancient Greek philosophy, medieval natural philosophy, and the modified forms of natural philosophy developed in the early modern period," the *sciential* advancements of the period were not "scientific" in the modern sense of the term (Cunningham and Williams 430-31).

[10] In "Genealogy and the Body: Foucault/Deleuze/Nietzsche," Scott Lash notes that "the study of anatomy was king." See *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*, 258.

[11] See Raymond Crawfurd's *Plague and Pestilence in Literature and Art*, 135; David Hoeniger's *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*, 72; Benjamin Lee Gordon's *Medieval and Renaissance Medicine*, 565, William McNeil's *Plagues and Peoples*, 183; Charles F. Mullett's *The Bubonic Plague and England: An Essay in the History of Preventitive Medicine*, 60; and Terence Ranger and Paul Slack's *Epidemics and Ideas: Essays on the Historical Perception of Pestilence*, 16.

[12] See V. Persaud's *Early History of Human Anatomy*, 147.

[13] See Andrew Cunningham's *The Anatomical Renaissance*, 3.

Despite the empirical innovations being made by these "Anatomizers" (Cotgrave A39), as Randle Cotgrave defined them, there was a radical upsurge in a "hands-off" anatomy developing simultaneously during the Renaissance. Coincidentally, to some degree, the rise of anatomy in continental Europe developed alongside the corresponding rise of satire in early modern London. While English anatomists like Thomas Vicary, John Caius, Helkiah Crooke, John Banister, and William Harvey were intellectually informed by ancient anatomists, English satirists such as Thomas Lodge, John Donne, Thomas Nashe, Ben Jonson, Thomas Dekker, and many others were rediscovering the classical satirical works of Juvenal, Horace, Persius, and Lucilius, among others. Although London produced no Vesalius, this early modern city did spawn a generation of anatomising writers operating within a satirical aesthetic which both dissembled and reconstructed the city and its inhabitants to often grotesque extremes. Like the "Surgeon [who] rips his body, to search what was perished within him," these comparative dissections anatomised the seemingly healthy body and the infected body, as well as the moral and the physical body of the city in a violent manner (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks III* 332). In fashioning this "corporeal apocalypse" the satirical dissections exposed a bodily interior which irrationally transcended the pragmatic realm of anatomical realism (Teskey 84).

Where Vesalius's study exalted the aesthetic virtues of the body -- the beauty and design of its organs, veins, arteries, bones and muscles -- the reductive satirical gaze could only envision the body's unaesthetic properties. Predictably, then, satirists set their sights on the corrupting material dross of the dissected body, its blood, its entrails, and especially its excrement. With bodies "Anatomiz'd in every Nerve and sinew, / With constant courage and contempt of feare," as Jonson argued, the legitimate anatomist required a strong constitution and an even stronger stomach (*EMO* I I 131-32). Much like the pre-Vesalian anatomist who lectured *ex cathedra*, that is, from a safe distance and without bloodying or, in most cases it would seem, muddying his hands,[14] the satirical anatomist attempted to keep the symbolic filth from soiling his own character. In stark contrast to the intellectual method of Vesalius and his English followers, however, the more virtual satirical anatomies were largely anti-intellectual, as Bacon pointed out in *Book Two* of *The Advancement of Learning* [1605].[15] Yet as the anatomist sought accurate mimetic representations of the dissected body through visual print media, the satirist worked in a non-mimetic satirical mode and remained largely unconcerned with so-called "accurate" bodily representations. According to the satirist, the short-sighted anatomist wrongly focused his gaze solely upon the material body, because, as Thomas Adams argued, "The Signes of the corporall [we]re more palpable, then, of the sprirituall sickenesse" (*DOS* 58). For the satirical Adams, the physical body only showed the outward effects of infection and not the more dangerous interior "spiritual" threat of disease and pestilence.

---

[14] The dirty and dungy body will be discussed in Chapter II where I examine the uninfected excremental body.

[15] In *Book Two* of *The Advancement of Learning*, Bacon spoke of deceptive writers such as satirists

> who seek to please the reader more than nature beareth, and chiefly well disposed in the spirits thereof, being agreeable to truth and apt for action; and far removed from that natural infirmity, whereunto I noted those that write in their own professions to be subject, which is, that they exalt it above measure. (Bacon *Maj Wks* 253)

Working within his own grotesque aesthetic, the deceptive satirist regularly vivisected a non-corporeal body in the process of decomposition.[16] The bodily epistemology he sought to expose was not of the living or dead flesh but composed of some non-corporeal atrophic metaphysical or spiritual tissue. Somewhat like the bodily matter metaphorically extruded out of scripture in James Forrester's *The Marrow and Ivice of Two Hvndred and Sixtie Scriptvres* [1611], the symbolic "marrow" and '"juice" of the anatomised body were also figurative fluids. Forrester's approach was indicative of the satirical penchant to flay "not the dead Sceleton, but the liuing Anatomy of the body and soule of our Iesus Christ, God and Man," fostering the vivisection of the mortal body and the transcendent soul. In extracting these "base" symbolic liquids, Forrester and other satirists claimed to edge closer to revealing the essence of the "true" anatomy (Forrester A6).

As the wealth of published pamphlets attested, there was a renewed and spirited interest in both medical and moral anatomy in late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth-century London. Although very much a symbolic investigation, for the anatomizing satirist this was a gross anatomy – a sadistic sublime – the vivisection of a monstrous body and the mapping of a monstrous city. While physicians and surgeons dissected the cadavers of criminals, satirical writers dissected a variety of what they considered "grotesque" individual and social ills: namely vice and sin. These "new anatomies" were considered unspurious texts[17] because they claimed the legitimacy of the natural philosophical texts, texts which were also concerned with God and human nature.[18] Of course, the satyr-anatomist's contribution to medical knowledge was ultimately negligible and often regressive. Where Bacon's writings reformed natural philosophy,[19] the satirist deformed natural philosophy. Satyr-anatomists did not physically cut into any bodies -- their virtual anatomies were inspired by scripture and satirical revenge -- not empirical reality. Moreover, the medicines prescribed in the anatomy were not plague-water or amulets, but piety and repentance. Nevertheless, Elizabethan and Jacobean readers relied on the spiritual gaze of both satirical and medical anatomists for empirical verifiability of the humoural body and Godly explanation of the sacred and grotesquely profane human body.

---

[16] The satyr-anatomist viewed the body as a sinfully animated corpse. This candidly ascetic mediation was convincing because in death, the body was reduced to dust and worm fodder. See Robert Gottfried's discussion in *The Black Death*, 89.

[17] A certain level of authority is founded upon the text's printing. Printing unquestionably helped legitimize the author's claims.

While original "English" contributions to anatomical discovery were extremely limited in the sixteenth century,[20] that intellectual void began to close in the seventeenth century.[21] Though they could not match the sheer proliferation of published satirical anatomies, the English anatomists did contribute to medical knowledge and innovation. Unlike the medical anatomists, however, satirical anatomists seemed to cling to the moral anatomies of the past by further embellishing the decidedly fantastical misconceptions of earlier dissective endeavours. By exposing the bodily horrors of vice didactically, satirical anatomists hoped morally to re-educate Londoners in a concerted effort to rid the city of the "Anthropophagized" plague that consumed many inhabitants in its pestilential wake.

---

[18] "As part of Natural Philosophy," as Jonathan Sawday remarks, "anatomy never ceased to be centrally about God. Anatomy was not a study which was primarily of value to medicine, and also about God. It was the other way about: it was primarily about God, and also of value to medicine" (Sawday 38).

[19] See Julian Martin's *Francis Bacon, the State, and the Reform of Natural Philosophy*, 141-171.

[20] In *The History of the University of Oxford Vol IV*, Robert G. Frank notes that in late-sixteenth-century England, "There were no institutions for teaching anatomy by dissection -- or at all, for that matter -- nor were there facilities for learning medical botany or chemistry" (Frank 506). Those who desired to learn anatomy at this time attended the universities at Padua, Basle or Leiden (Ibid.) See also K.F. Russell's *British Anatomy 1525-1800*, xvii.

[21] As Robert G. Frank notes the "floodgates" of the new anatomy really opened during the latter half of the seventeenth century. See *The History of the University of Oxford Vol IV*, 536.

Emulating the philosophical tone of medical discourse, the satirist often pleaded his honest intentions as he penetrated bodily envelopes: "faire indeed they are to outward eyes," as R.C. expressed in *The Times Whistle* [1615], because the naked eye could "not discerne inward deformities" (R C. 50). As he attempted to shake readers out of their sinful complacency, the truth was, argued the satirist, much more than skin deep.

Between the mid-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century, London had an artistic collective of its own, a satirical congregation manufacturing symbolic meta-anatomies. The early modern architects of satirical anatomy were numerous and began essentially with William Bullein's *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1563], reaching their most wildly original in the 1590s with Nashe and Marston, and finally peaking with the publication of Robert Burton's satire on depression: *The Anatomy of Melancholy* [1621]. Framed by Bullein's and Burton's Menippean works, the Juvenalian diatribes of Elizabethan and Jacobean satyr-anatomists were considerably more virulent in their dissections of humanity and disease. While the "Skin flaine" in Bullein's dialogue was excoriated in pursuit of the cause of plague, Burton's treatise was not specifically about plague, though he did allude to the rigours of pestilence as his comprehensive analysis vivisected the body in search of the various sources of melancholy (*DFP* 84). Citing Melanchthon for his inspiration, Burton believed it was a filthy ignorance not to anatomise the body: "And what can be more ignominous and filthy (as Melanchthon well inveighs)," wrote Burton, "***than for a man* not *to know the structure and composition of his own body, especially since the knowledge of it tends so much to stir the preservation of his health, and information of his manners*?" (*AM Pt 1 Sec 1: 128*; emphasis mine). Burton's exhaustive and detailed psychological speculations were especially indicative of the propensity to anatomise any troubling subject of the early modern experience. For Bullein, Burton, and their satirical contemporaries, the anatomy was a necessary evil: necessary for medical understanding and necessary for morality.

To the satirist's credit -- whether under the empirical direction of Vesalius, Helkiah Crooke, Thomas Vicary, or William Harvey – physical anatomy was a grisly prospect at best. As the anatomist John Banister said, anatomical discovery was the fruit of "these my rude labours" (Banister A4). Of course the visceral experience of the anatomy was hyperbolized *ad nauseam* because satirical anatomies transcended the natural philosophical gaze. In what was a patently sublime symbolic process, the satirist conducted living autopsies: detestable symbolic vivisection's upon grotesque, "un-divine" bodies. In the satirical realm, the flayed living body occupied a liminal space within a visionary scheme where the organic body became suspiciously inorganic. This was a vivisection that knew no corporeal boundaries and a visceral process which became increasingly disgusting as the satirist fashioned and vivisected the morally grotesque and physically repugnant bodies of a population Samuel Rowlands nonchalantly dismissed as "the off-scumme of the world" (Rowlands *Wks I*: 3).

But where non-satirical writers anatomised with a detailed analysis of a subject divided by sections and subsections, the more selective and highly moralistic analysis of the satyr-anatomist included a simplistic and haphazard tearing open of the very bowels of London and her inhabitants in his search for the sinful origins which would explain the divine cause of London's pestilential ills. Although Frye's comment on *The Anatomy of Melancholy* [1621] as an "intellectual approach" to the human subject aptly applied to a serious writer like the Menippean Robert Burton, the satyr-anatomist operated in a more Juvenalian mode. If anything, the non-Menippean satirist was anti-intellectual and crude in his anatomy of pestilence. Anatomising through rhetorical conventions, then, London satirists leaned more towards John Bullokar and Bartholomew Traheron's medical definition of "anatomie." According to Bullokar's *An English Expositor* [1616], "antomie was "An incision or cutting. The art of knowing the situation, office, and nature of all the parts of a mans body" (Bullokar B7), whereas for Traheron's *Vigo's Chirugerie* [1586], "Anatomie . . . Signifieth the cutting vp of a mans bodie" (*OED* CD ROM). In a deceptively figurative approach, the satyr-anatomist "cut and search[ed] every part," as Bullokar and Traheron suggested, but with a more deliberately violent edge (Bullokar B7).

In his *A Newe Anatomie of whole man* [1579], John Woolton maintained that although it was "an yrkesome and cruell thing, to cut and mangle mans lymmes and members," Woolton concluded, "yet the ende and use of the same is both necessarie and profitable, in all the course and trade of mans life" (*ANA* I). Similarly, S.H. noted in *A new treatise of the pestilence* [1603], "This cruell disease" (S.H. A5) demanded that the satirist and anatomist had to be cruel to be kind. In other words, both competing anatomies, satire and legitimate anatomy, had to deform the urban body to reform the urban body.[22] Just as Nashe had suggested in *Christes Teares Over Ierusalem* [1593] – "To desperate diseases must desperate Medicines be applyde" – desperate anatomies sought cures for precarious diseases like plague (Nashe *Wks II*: 20). Blending the discursive with the real, then, satirical anatomists transcended the dissective medical gaze with a grotesque vision manifest through a series of sadistic moral vivisections. And as Marston's Pietro concluded in *The Malcontent* [1604], "When nothing helps, cut off the rotten part": the satirist incised and dismembered the symbolic body until it was utterly void of its foul corporeality (*MAL* I viii 73).

As it was for the dissector, anatomy was central to satirical art, and writers regularly dissected what the satirical physician Thomas Lodge described as London's "spectacle of follye" (Lodge *Comp Wks I*: 1) or what Joseph Hall often in crude detail referred to in his *Virgidemiarvm* [1598] as "the mis-ordred world, and lawlesse times" of the city (Hall *Coll. Poems* I i 12). "Through choice of faultes, and purest vice selected," as Thomas Bastard put it in *Chrestoleros* [1598] (*CSB* 106), by articulating "euery pertyculer and neglygent vyce" imaginable, as George Gascoigne did in *The Needles Eye* [157?], the satyr-anatomist practised his symbolic art on a corrupt city-at-large and through stock-character- types – including the rake, the whore, the drunkard, the usurer, the masterless man, the greedy, the gambler, stage actors, or any other hedonistic creature he considered worthy of his misanthropic abuses (Gascoigne *Comp Wks III* 381). The invective anatomy scathed and dissected every Londoner; none was spared the satirical wrath. In *The Anatomie of Abuses* [1583], Phillip Stubbes even attacked "The horrible Vice of pestiferous dauncing," for example (*AA* M8). As John Barclay expressed in *Euphormio's Satyricon* [1605]: "the whole human race -- are the chosen targets for my rage," satirists indicted all Londoners with their berating anatomical rants (Barclay 3).

---

[22] By "deform" I mean that while satire dissected and misshapened its victims rhetorically, comparative anatomy hacked and dissembled its subjects of study physiologically.

Unlike the more orthodox dissections observed by natural philosophers and physicians, the satirical anatomy was more subversive and distorted. Reviving Galenist traditions, then, the satirist reverted to virtual anatomy, dissecting what he considered the vilest animal of all: the rational animal, or *homo absurdus*[23] to be more precise. This endeavour was, of course, no small task. With respect to the sheer scale of urban vice and mass mortality occurring during outbreaks, the extravagant asininity of London proved overwhelming. As the satirist's Sisyphean venture would document, an absurd subject required an even more absurd anatomical method.

---

[23] While the term *homo absurdus* is a late-nineteenth century invention, the concept of absurd humanity can be traced back to Aristophanes, Plautus, Terence, Chaucer, Erasmus, and Cervantes, to name only a few. See J.A. Cuddon's *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, 967.

Anatomising Absurdity and Satirical *Malpraxis*

The satyr-anatomist was an absurd hero of sorts. He was no buffoon because his baneful narrative role mostly excluded comic absurdity. As Gordon Teskey, in *Allegory and Violence* [1996] suggests, "Absurdity" was "the trope of sublimity"– the satirist's textual existence exuded a tragic strangeness – he was a solitary figure, an outsider *in media res* of a hostile, infectious world (Teskey 46). Voicing the abuses of an entire (de)generation the satirist attacked the essential absurdity of London and the city's insistence on transgressing the norms of orthodox Christian doctrine. This was a frustrating endeavour, however, for no matter how hard the satyr-anatomist railed, anatomised, or shamed his audience, London remained unreformed and plague continued to thrive and recur. His surreal anatomical method seemed an appropriate one, considering that epidemics were the quintessential absurdist experience, as the pious, along with the sinful, fell victim to the disease. This "blindly seeking out both sinner and sinless," or "random celestial swatting," as Leeds Barroll refers to it, seemed to challenge orthodox claims, thereby opening up the possibility of more interpretive absurdist anatomies (Barroll 95-6).

Thomas Nashe, the author of *The Anatomie of Absvrditie* [1589], has the distinction of being early modern London's premier absurdist anatomiser. While the focus of Nashe's pamphlet was an attack upon the artificiality of Renaissance romances (Ousby 707), Nashe saw fit to excoriate the sins and abuses of London as well. In this wildly innovative work, Nashe viewed the anatomy as an "absurd" prospect but a necessary one. Speaking on the immoral state of London, as he would do in the equally absurd allegory, *Christs Teares Over Ierusalem* [1593], Nashe had contended he was "vrged to take a view of sundry mens vanitie, a suruey of their follie, a briefe of their barbarisme . . . that each one at the first sight may eschew it as infectious, to shewe it to the worlde that all men may shun it" (Nashe *Wks I*: 9). According to Nashe's "voyce-crazing vehemencie" (Nashe *Wks II*: 165), the infectious plague was not the result of some natural cause but was brought on by the "vanitie," "follie," and "barbarisme" of the "brute Beastes" he spoke out against (Nashe *Wks I*: 40). Absurd times undoubtedly inspired absurd moral and even medical commentary.[24]

For Nashe and the satyr-anatomist, the sublimely "absurd" anatomy expounded just how radical a departure anatomical satire was from the empirical approach of comparative anatomy, for example. While Nashe admitted that "some may object, that I goe beyond my Anatomie, in touching these abusive enormities," the implications of Nashe's moral scheme would prove debasing (Ibid. 37). The body "beautiful" inscribed by humanist anatomists, for example, was abjectly subverted by Nashe's fabrication and dissection of the grotesquely sublime body, a process described by Nashe as the "paynting forth [of] theyr vgly imperfections" (Ibid. 16). Of course, unlike Bacon's rational paradigm, the satirical aesthetic observed unnatural phenomena: not concrete, but abstract facts with a misanthropic hypothesis that was already a foregone conclusion.

For Bacon, knowledge was power, whereas for the satirist, invective ignorance was sovereign. Where vice and folly had been attacked in "satire and cynically" rather "than seriously and wisely," as Bacon pointed out in *Book Two* of *The Advancement of Learning* [1605], within these feigned anatomies, the early modern body and the city would become targets of the satirists' anatomical rituals of degradation and abuse, and not subjects of medical inquiry (Bacon *Maj Wks*: 253). What separates Robert Burton's satire from the other satires examined in this study is that Burton's Menippean narrator, the intellectual Democritus Junior, was much less misanthropic than, say, the Juvenalian satyr-satirist narrator, such as John Marston's W. Kinsayder, from *The Scourge of Villainie* [1599] or any of the narrative personae constructed by Nashe or Dekker. Despite the pessimistic and condescending views these satirists held of the city and its inhabitants, their insults to their readers, "the most desperate and fowlest players in the world," do not seem to have had an adverse effect on sales because the impolite practice was commonplace (*SDS* 2).

---

[24] Robert G. Frank Jr. notes that even the "imagination" was sometimes cited as the cause of disease. See Frank's "Medicine" in *The History of the University of Oxford Vol IV*, 533.

Though Nashe declared "Science hath no enemie but the ignoraunt," Nashe, like his parodic cronies, nevertheless dismissed the rational methodology in favour of symbolic vivisection (Nashe *Wks I*: 35). As Nashe attested, in order to discern the causes of urban wickedness and its mortal and pestilential effects, the satirist saw fit to dissect the city's corrupt, metaphysical or symbolic bodies in images of disease, decay, and disgust, which were typically and vitriolically indicative of Renaissance satire, as Jonathan Hart argues.[25] Focusing on the *Favltes favlts and nothing else but favltes* [1606] as Barnaby Rich did in his satirical assault on London, writers, such as Robert Greene in *A looking Glasse for London and England* [1594], threatened "a scourge for euery priuie fault" they hypercritically dissected (Greene *Wks XIV*: 86).

In dissecting absurdly deceptive bodies, all was not as it appeared. John Donne, for example, noted that the satirical anatomy was an equally unflattering or "ruinous Anatomie" (Donne *Maj Wks* 104). As a legitimate anatomist would concur, the satirical poet could "learn'st thus much by our Anatomie" (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 334) by "behold[ing] the mis-shapen vglinesse and absurd inconsequence of this Sinne" (Rous 1622: 266). In contrast to Rous' *The Diseases of the Time, Attended by*

---

[25] See Jonathan Hart's *Theatre and World*, 42.

their Remedies [1622], Donne's less-violent "Anatomy of the World" was a more polite, cautionary work which dissected the globe in an attempt to remind Londoners that despite gay appearances and brief absences of epidemic, one should not be fooled by outward impressions. Indeed, Donne would have agreed with Dekker who reminded his readers, the "fairest faces hath often times the fowlest bodies" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks IV* 195).

The satirical anatomy was, therefore, more about wit than medical wisdom, a point raised by Bacon and reinforced by Donne in "From a sermon preached before King Charles I" [1627]. "We make satires," wrote Donne,

> and we look that the world should call that wit; when God knows, that that is in a great part, self-guiltiness, and we do by reprehend those things, which we ourselves have done, we cry out upon the illness of the times, and we make the times ill: so the calumniator whispers those things, which are true nowhere but in himself. (Donne *Maj Wks* 381)

A satirist in his younger days, Donne, who grew more pious, acknowledged here how satire magnified and distorted the tragic reality of life in pest-ridden London. As Donne suggested, these were ill times that were made even sicker by satirical anatomies. While the satirist insisted upon anatomising the sickly city, Donne argued that such writers were "calumniators," false and malicious anatomists whose slanders were erroneous, macabre, and absurdly extreme (Ibid. 381). Though Donne admitted the dangers of invective wit, his cautionary warnings rarely prevented him from committing the same anatomical atrocities he condemned his contemporaries for.

In "The First Anniversary. An Anatomy of the World," for example, Donne dissected the frail, plague-ridden condition of early modern London: "Thou knowst how lame a cripple this world is / And learnst thus much by our Anatomy" (Donne

Comp Eng Poe 336). Moreover,

> . . . this worlds generall sicknesse doth not lie
> In any humour, or one certain part;
> But, as thou sawest it rotten at the hart,
> Thou seest a Hectique fever hath got hold
> Of the whole substance, not to be contrould,
> And that thou hast but one way, not t'admit
> The worlds infection, to be none of it. (Ibid. 336)

Within the framework of Donne's symbolic anatomy, dissection could not reveal any natural cause for a divine disease. Whether in the throes of fever or infection, humoural imbalance, or even "rotten at hart," Donne's anatomy of the "crippled world" of London could be forestalled not by some medical miracle discovered through physical anatomy but be avoided by not becoming consumed in the sins of the city. It was almost as if that by denying disease, or, as Donne said, "not t'admit / The worlds infection," plague and other infectious diseases would simply disappear with the sins that created them. This is perhaps a naive view for us, but it was a tenable stance for an early modern poet inhabiting an urban macrocosm perpetually threatened by "divinely" recurring epidemics.

Throughout the early modern period, both physical and symbolic anatomies were arts in their own fashion yet were more similar to one another than we like to imagine. Many legitimate physicians and anatomists were indeed university trained,[26] but many were not. According to William Bullein's "Medicus" in *A*

---

[26] As Robert Frank Jr. explains, the academic route to the DM took a minimum of fourteen years. Owing to its intensiveness and length of study, only a relatively small number of physicians completed the degree. According to Frank,

> Four years of reading and disputation in grammar, rhetoric, logic, mathematics, moral philosophy, and some Greek led to the BA; a further three years of philosophical studies brought the young scholar to the MA. Only then, at least according to the statutes, could he commence studies in one of the three higher faculties of theology, law, or medicine.

Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence [1578], the physician

> must be first a good natural Philospher, he must haue the knowledge of tymes and seasons, and bee acquainted with complexions of men, of obseruyng the nature of thynges, and the climates vnder heauen, with the course of the Sunne, Moone, and Starres, ayre and diet. (DFP 32)

Being licensed by the College of Physicians, of course, did not guarantee that the physician had a degree. As A.W. Sloan notes, "To get a [medical] licence testimonials were required from accredited physicians or 'persons of quality', stating that the applicant was well known as a practitioner of medicine and surgery" (Sloan 141). Owing to a combination of the increased demand for plague cures and a shortage of medical doctors, quackery flourished during outbreaks. To help the literate consumer separate the quack from the physician, Johann Oberndoerffer offered his own anatomy, *The anatomyes of the true phystion, and counterfeit mounte-banke* [1602], as did Sir Thomas Overbury dissect the "Quacksaluer" and other corrupt "characters" of London in his *Conceited Newes* [1613].[27]

In London anatomy was strictly regulated for the surgeon, but less so for the highly literate satirist. Indeed, any articulate early modern could anatomise satirically; as Nashe wrote in *Haue with You to Saffron-Walden* [1596]: "if thou wilt haue the Doctour for an Anatomie . . . I am the man will deliuer him to thee to be scotcht and carbonadoed" (Nashe *Wks III*: 17). While the satirist wasn't put to death for *malpraxis* writings, it was nevertheless "satire," as Northrop Frye notes, that put

---

The *studiosus medicinae* was required to attend the lectures of the regius professor of medicine and to take part in disputations in the schools. After three years he could petition to be admitted BM and, after an additional four, to be admitted DM. To complete the degree, the incepting doctor had to read a course of either three long or six short lectures on a 'Galenic' subject. See Robert G. Frank's *The History of the University of Oxford Vol. IV*, 508.

[27] Although Herring's translation of Oberndoerffer railed against quackery, Sir Thomas Overbury invoked disgust to denounce the mountebank in his *Conceited Newes*. According to Overbury, "His [the mountebank's] discourse is vomit; and his ignorance, the strongest purgation in the world." (See *The "Conceited Newes" of Sir Thomas Overbury and His Friends*, 201).

"Nashe, Jonson, Marston and Wither into gaol" (Frye 1977: 337). As the Marprelate controversy proved, satirical tracts could be burned or banned, as they were during the Bishop's Ban of 1599,[28] a hostile political reaction to politically subversive[29] moralist entertainment, to be certain. But, then, who was to argue that the satirist could not be as capable as his medical counterparts of diagnosing disease. Those counterparts' own cures, as will become apparent, were as absurdly experimental as much of the nonsensical cures suggested by the satirical mountebank.

In Renaissance London it seemed every school of thought had a curative answer for plague and other afflictions. As was typical of the satirical position, Nashe, in *The Unfortunate Traveller* [1594], summed up the medical profession this way:

> Galen might go shoe the gander for any good he could do, his secretaries had so long called him divine, that now he had lost all his virtue upon earth. Hippocrates might well help almanac makers, but here he had not a word to say; a man might sooner catch the sweat with plodding over him to no end, than cure the sweat with any of his impotent principles. Paracelsus with his spirit of the buttery and his spirit of minerals could not so much as say, 'God amend him to the matter'. (Nashe *Wks II*: 230)

As Nashe explained, the satirists had good reason to be sceptical of the fragmented discipline known as early modern medicine.

Although a "corporall Plague," pestilence remained largely a spiritual illness (*TKM* C3). As satirists investigated the "spirituall furniture which we must carry with vs," the medical anatomist made considerable empirical contributions to natural philosophy by focusing on the corporeal body (J.D. 36). While the satirical anatomists opened symbolic wounds of metaphysical proportions, London's anatomical elite was carving its own way into medical history. Indeed, by the first quarter of the seventeenth century, William Harvey had set radical new English and continental standards in anatomy. Harvey's anatomical lectures, *Prelectiones anatomiae universalis* [1616], recognised the errors of Galen[30] and promoted new directions in anatomy, but it was *De motu cordis et sanguinis* [1628] that secured Harvey's name in medical and anatomical history.[31] The discovery of the circulation of the blood was a momentous achievement in a context where freshly killed hens and pigeons were still being applied to buboes[32] and people were, amongst other things, advised by medical writers such as Thomas Thayre, Simon Kellwaye, and Francis Herring to "drink twice in the day a draught of their own urine"[33] to prevent infection from plague. Pharmacologic exorcism, or the driving out bodily evils with evil tasting or bizarre concoctions (by modern standards), remained popular treatments employed by licensed physicians, including Shakespeare's son-in-law, John Hall.[34]

---

[28] See Matthew Hodgart's *Satire*, 141.

[29] See Julian Martin's *Francis Bacon, the State, and the Reform of Natural Philosophy*, 38, 59, 148, & 193.

Physicians tested a variety of treatments for plague and other diseases. William Harvey, for example, treated tumors "by the laying on of dead hands,"[35] while the physicist Robert Boyle cured nosebleeds by placing a special moss that had been grown on an Irishman's skull into the sufferer's palm.[36] In *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* [1596], Sir John Harington, referring to Paracelsian curatives, added, "some Physicians say, the smel of a Jakes is good against the plague" (*MOA* 134). Among other popular beliefs of the early moderns, tobacconists and butchers were also apparently immune from plague.[37] Mirroring the folklore of plague, "Face" in Jonson's *The Alchemist* (V.i.), as F.P. Wilson notes, conveyed the notion that "Three or four peeled onions left in the ground for ten days would gather all the infection in the neighbourhood" (Wilson 9). If nothing else, moss, dead hands and the ingestion of urine made repentance seem more affordable and perhaps sensible, if not more appetizing, than the bulk of early modern medical cures.

---

[30] Gweneth Whitteridge notes that while Harvey outlined the anatomical errors of Galen, Harvey also excused Galen and the ancients for their shortcomings by suggesting that "the body had changed since the days of antiquity." See Gweneth Whitteridge's "Introduction" to *The Anatomical Lectures of William Harvey [1616]*, xxxi.

[31] While Harvey's antomies were conducted at Oxford, his texts were printed in London.

[32] According to I.W.:

> If there do a botch appeare: Take a Pigeon and plucke the fethers off her taile, very bare and set her taile to the sore, and shee will drawe out the venome till shee die; then take another and set to likewise continuing so till all the venome be drawne out. Which you shall see by the Pigeons, for they will die with the venome as long as there is any in it: also a chicken or a henne is verie good. (I.W. B5)

[33] See Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 31 & 352.

[34] Robert Hudson has noted that John Hall had "prescribed among other things webs of spiders, animal excreta, and dried cocks' windpipes, and in one of his own illnesses he had a live pigeon opened and applied it to the soles of his feet to 'draw down the vapours'." See Robert P. Hudson's *Disease and Its Control*, 200.

[35] See David Hoeniger's *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*, 19.

In spite of the satirical hostilities directed at the medical profession, humanist physicians were frequently on the same side as the godly satirists. In his *Watch-Man for the Pest* [1625], for example, the physician Stephen Bradwell articulated a more divine position of disease transmission and causation. According to Bradwell:

> The Plague, is a popular Disease: sent immediately from God; wrought by the constellations of the Heavens, the Corruption of the Aire, and the Disorder of Mans Diet: At the first striking to the Heart, is Venemous, Deadly, and Infectious: And for the most part accompanied with a Feavor; As also with Spots called Gods-Tokens, or with Blayne, or Botch, or Carbuncle. (*WMP* 2)

Bradwell's medical position was not unique and was echoed by Lodge, among many others.

While theories of infection evolved in medical discourse, the staunchly conservative satirical forces that circulated in print worked towards devolving and mocking scholarly progress by promoting and sustaining the Christian myths of plague because they took natural causes out of the equation. The empirical observations recorded by legitimate anatomists, therefore, became little more than grotesque fantasies for the regressive and morally orthodox satirists. Through the anatomical gaze, the satirist could symbolically explore the entrails he fashioned out of London's vilest bodies in visionary ways. The local colour of epidemic continued to take on a nauseating hue as the satirist coupled horror with his sensationalist and didactic tragedies through his symbolic scalpel: the pen.

---

[36] Ibid., 19.

[37] See Charles Mullett's *The Bubonic Plague and England: An Essay in the History of Preventative Medicine*, 194 & 207.

'Morall Goore with pleasaunt penne in hande': Scribing the Anatomy

Without the aid of the "conuenient Instruments" of the legitimate anatomist, the

> Razors of all sortes, great, small, meane, sharpe, blunt, straight, crooked, and edged on both sides; Sheares or Sizers; round and large long Probes of Brasse, Siluer, Lead; a Knife of Box or of Iuory, Pincers of all sorts; hooks, Needels bent rather then straite, Reeds, Quils, Glasse-trunkes or hollow Bugles to blowe vp the parts, Threds and strings, Sawes, Bodkins, Augers, Mallets, Wimbles or Trepans, Basons and Sponges (*MCM* 27),

satirical anatomists had no recourse but to penetrate the corrupt fabric of the body with pen, scripture, and above all, a crude and vulgar imagination. As John Weever confessed, the satyr delighted to "flesh [hi]s penne with the fatte of [the] filthinesse" (Weever *Whip Pamph I* 16) he witnessed in London, while John Taylor complained that George Wither "In sharp Ramnusiaes Pisse, his Pen he dip'd" (Taylor *Wks I*: 5). Satirists like Weever, Taylor and Wither were discursive anatomists more skilled with Ockham's razor[38] than a Vesalian scalpel. As Burton stated pointedly in his *Anatomy*, "the pen is much worse than the sword"; the satyr-anatomists of early modern London would reconfirm this view time and again (*AM Pt 1 Sec 2*: 290). Although we might dismiss the power of the pen in our own age, the early moderns would have been less inclined to do so. The profound impact of the pen is what likely inspired the engraver of Vesalius's title page for the *Fabrica* to take liberties with the anatomical enterprise, because, as Andrew Cunningham notes, a close examination of the engraving reveals that Vesalius is, in fact, grasping a stylus in his right hand, not a scalpel.[39]

Stephen Gosson, the anti-theatrical pamphleteer, was instrumental in further sustaining the controversies of the contestable dissected body.[40] In his uniquely own empiricist timbre, Gosson argued in *The Schoole of Abuse* [1579], that "The Anatomy of man" was "set out by experience" (Gosson C5o). But Gosson, like Nashe, Dekker, Guilpin, Jonson, Donne, and many others, was no physicians or surgeons. As Gosson confessed,

> Though my skill in Phisicke bee small, I haue some experience in these

---

[38] I invoke William of Ockham here because, like the early modern satirists, Ockham maintained the "principle of simplicity." As such, Ockham's theory – "entities are not to be multiplied beyond necessity" – inspired the satirist to not so much multiply as he did divide the body physiology, albeit sometimes beyond absurd necessity.

[39] Andrew Cunningham reveals this clever discovery in *The Anatomical Renaissance*, 128.

[40] In spite his professed disdain for dramatic theatre, Gosson expressed a curious penchant for the anatomy theatre. In this sense, he sided with his adversary, the poet and physician Thomas Lodge. While Gosson attacked the theatre in *The Schoole of Abuse* [1579], Lodge defended the dramatic arts, poetry, and music in his *A Reply to Stephen Gosson's Schoole of Abuse in Defence of Poetry Musick and Stage Plays* [1580]. Despite their opposing opinions about art and aesthetics, both writers seem to agree on the subject of anatomy. Indeed, by tearing back the "ranke fleshe," Gosson could expose the interior of what Thomas Lodge described as "our human filthines" (Lodge *Wks I*: 31). Like Gosson and Lodge, Nicholas Bownd saw fit to flay the skin in order to reveal the "naturall corruption, cleauing fast vnto vs" (Bownd 2) exposing what William Bullein described as the "Rhetoricall coloures" (*DFP* 3) of the bodily interior's variety of disgustingly persuasive hues. In a corresponding vein, the dramatist Shackerley Marmion, shifted the emphasis away from the theatre by drawing a link between satirist, the coney-catcher, and the civilian in *The Soddered Citizen* [1623]. According to the anatomising Marmion: "The fleshe of a Cittizen [wa]s as ranke, & as unwholesome, as a tame Coney, that feeds on playsters" (*TSC* III ix 1632-33). As Marmion pointed out, while dramatist, satirist, and clergyman debated one another, writers of radically opposing perspectives were frequently united in dissecting the urban and the civilian grotesqueries of their culture.

> maladyes, which I thrust out with my penne to euery mans viewe, yeelding the ranke fleshe to the Chiurugions knife, and so ridde my handses of the cure, for it passeth my cunning too heale them priuily (Ibid. 5),

the only "experience" these writers had with anatomy was moral, invective imagination. This was, as William Bullein simply put it, an anatomy of "Morall Goore with pleasaunt penne in hande" (*DFP* 16). "Plucke vpp a good courage, mine infant pen," bemoaned Nashe, "and wearily struggle (as well as thou maist) thorow thys huge word-dearthing taske" (Nashe *Wks II*: 69).

In *The Weeping Lady: Or, London Like Ninivie in Sack-Cloth* [1625], Thomas Brewer resented having the task of anatomising plague, complaining that he was "too weak a Pencil-Man for such a Piece" (*TWL* A2). Brewer's melancholic disclaimers, however, did not prevent him from sentimentally dissecting "this heauily bewayled Contagion" (Ibid. C4). In a slight departure from the satyr-anatomist, Brewer "Describ[ed] the Mappe of [London's] miserie, in this time of Her heauy Visitation" (Ibid., A1) through a more mournful lexicon, a setting which, William Muggins argued, "The learned Homer could not pen . . . well" (*LMG* B1). While Brewer spoke of divine retribution, he did not threaten satirical revenge like the purist satyr. Brewer was, of course, the exception to the rule.

Despite his medical ignorance, then, the satirist often fancied himself as a novice dissector with good or justifiably vengeful intentions. The satirical scalpel for his anatomical escapades was none other than the "bastard quill" (Weever *Whip Pamph I* 37). Indeed, the only buboes lanced by satirists were the moral eruptions they claimed to locate on the bodily landscapes they mapped and condemned in the same "rank breath." Dekker explained the discursive anatomy in *Newes from Hell* [1606] this way:

> I fell to my tooles (pen, inke, and paper) roundly . . . after hee had cast vp

> what lay in his stomacke, suspecting that I came rather as a spie to betray him, then as a spirit to runne of his errands, and that I was more likely to haue him to Barber Surgeons hall, there to Anatomize him. (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks II* 95)

As Dekker articulated, the satirical anatomy was not simply a Foucauldian medical gaze but a dissective gaze – not simply surveillance but a figurative dismemberment of a "betrayed" body.

In *A Sermon preached at Pawles Crosse* [1578], for example, the preacher Thomas White suggested it was the satirists' symbolic role "to play both the Phisition and Surgeon . . . and thrust diligently [their] sword of justice in, to launce out all coruption and baggage which is gathered in the bowels" of the symbolic anatomy theatre known as Greater London (White F7).[41] If Padua was the centre of anatomy on the continent, satirical London, with its "clowde-climing slaughter-stack of . . . Dead carkases" (Nashe *Wks II*: 49) was, as George Wither suggested in *Britain's Remembrancer* [1628], "the Slaughter-house of Death," a grotesque human abattoir where the satirist conducted and recorded his dissective metaphysical investigations (*BR I* 33).

"Gainst her owne bowels thou Arts weapons turnst": for Nashe, the "ink-squirting" pen was what mutilated the grotesque body most in the discursive realm of the virtual anatomy (Nashe *Wks III*: 280). It was not in a lecture hall or an anatomy theatre, but upon parchment that the satirical anatomists best exposed the freakish complexities of the human body, indulging not in the glory of creation but in its figurative and dissective carnage. As R.C. put it in *The Times Whistle* [1615]: "Let vlcerd limbes and gowtie humours quake, / Whilst my pen I doe incision make"; the anatomical subject was extended no tender mercies (R.C. 2). Where medicine had speculated on the intricate wonders of the body, satire degraded the human body by musing solely upon its abject failings. In the hands of the illegitimate "imitators of lewd beastlines," as John Marston described them, satirical anatomists dismembered a grotesque body composed of the less-appealing properties of the macrocosm: filth, slime, but most of all, as Chapter Two will demonstrate, a repugnant excremental essence (*SOV* 93).

---

[41] As Jonson explained in *Every Man in His Humour* [1601], the dramatic theatre could also mirrored the anatomy theatre where the civic subjects became the "decay'd, ruinous, worm-eaten generation of the round" (*EMIH* III ii 217).

Unlike the misanthropical approach of the satirist, however, Vesalius' anatomical enterprise was a humanist one which dignified and ennobled the human body. Similarly, legitimate English anatomists like John Banister reinforced the genuine efforts of his discipline and the surgeons "Whose skilfull pennes have paynted so ech part and peece of Man, / As none lookes now to better it, (I thinke) nor euer can" (Banister C2). Although humanist physicians, like Banister and Francis Herring, maintained that there was no other body "so noble Subject as the body of man" (Herring 1604: C1), this secularized position was undermined by the satirical stance conveyed by writers such as William Cupper, who held that there was nothing "more fowle and filthy then we our selues are by nature" (CSC 32). As Shakespeare's Romeo described the "vile part of this anatomy," the body metamorphosed into what Juliet referred to as the "Despised substance of divinest show" (*ROM* III ii 106 & 77). There was nothing romantic about the satirical body – it was exclusively tragic.

In recording plague, the satyr-anatomist not only looked inward but outward as well. Through his "soild" imagination and misanthropic gaze, he turned an unflattering looking-glass upon London's most "fowlest" inhabitants. With his speculum of speculation, the satirist would differentiate between the sublime and the beautiful. The problem, however, is that while there was an abundance of sublimity, there was a pronounced absence of beauty. Without truth, beauty, and goodness, the reductive gaze of the satyr focused his critical eyes upon the bad and the ugly of satirical London.

'The Mirror Which Flatters Not': Neo-Platonic Cultural Mapping

The divide and rule phenomenon of epidemic -- the divine retribution which separated the sinful from the pious, and the quarantines and shutting up of infected houses that severed the sick from the healthy -- were mirrored by satirists in divide and rule strategies of their own devices. In many ranting tracts, the satyr claimed to be holding up a mirror which exposed the present vice and the absent piety of London. The unflattering reflection he painted in words was, however, a macabre *pastiche* of wickedness and death. This grotesque *memento mori* anatomy was reflected upon by Bullein's "Theologus" in *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578]:

> When you doe beholde your self in a glasse, remember your face shall bee leane and pale, your nose rotten, your teth stinkyng and blacke, your eyen dimme and blinde, your eares deafe, and runnyng, your Heeres fallen awaie, your Vaines broken, your Senewes relaxed and wasted, bone corupted, bowels ful of roumes and all your flesh consumed. (*DFP* 132)

Through the trope of the looking-glass, an array of satirists fixed a hypercritical gaze upon London and its inhabitants, manufacturing a grotesque image of a diseased and decaying city.[42] The distorted looking glass more imagined than reflected the "grosse deformity" of the city (Marston *Poems* 83). As Marston suggested in *Certaine Satyres* [1598] -- "Who would imagine that such squint-ey'd sight / Could strike the worlds deformities so right" – it took satirical eyes to capture the grotesque essence of the city in plague time (Ibid. 73).

In most plague satire, early modern writers mapped and anatomized both the microcosm and the macrocosm of allegorical London. This Neoplatonic concept – the notion of a "little cosmos" within the cosmos – was a popular one for comparative and satirical anatomy.[43] Indeed, Neoplatonism's "microcosm-macrocosm analogy [wa]s the "master metaphor of allegory" as Gordon Teskey argues (Teskey 184). By extension, then, great thinkers such as Isidore of Seville ran with the trope and contended that "All things [we]re contained in man, and in him exist[ed] the nature of all things."[44] This mingling of macro and micro matter was referred to by Neoplatonists as "the copulation of the world: subject and predicate, idea and substance, mind and nature, institution and body, ethos and history, promise and act, human and inhuman, doing it like wolves" (Teskey 76). A variety of English Renaissance writers explored the comparative, metaphorical, and copulative possibilities of Neoplatonism throughout the period.[45] Unlike their medical counterparts, however, satirical anatomists employed Neoplatonism as a trope rather than a profound philosophy. According to William Harvey's *Anatomical Lectures* [1616]: "Just as it is in the world so is it in the microcosm." Harvey's medical gaze also viewed the human body as a mirror of its culture (*ALH* 165). Similarly, Philip Stubbes adopted the rather ancient humanist approach: "Man is a wonderful Creature: and therfore is called in greek MICROCOSMOS, a litle world in himself" (*AA* A2). Helkiah Crooke's legitimate anatomy also remained fettered to Neoplatonic notions of the past and was further influenced by alchemy and the Paracelsian movement in England.

---

[42] William Rankins' *A Mirrovr of Monsters* [1587]; Thomas Churchyard's *The Mirrors of Man and the Manners of Men* [1594]; Thomas Lodge's *A Looking Glasse, for London and Englande* [1598]; C.G.'s *The Minte of Deformities* [1600]; John Davies of Hereford's *Mirum in modum. A Glimpse of Gods Glorie and The Soules Shape* [1602] and *The Triumph of Death: or, The Picture of the Plague: According to the Life, as it was in Anno Domini 1603* [1605]; Barnaby Rich's *Favltes favlts and nothing else but favltes* [1606]; H.A.'s *The Description of the late great, memorable and prodigious Plague 1625* [1625], John Taylor's *A Looking Glasse* [1630]; and Thomas Heywood's *Londini Speculum: Or Londons Mirror* [1637] are but a few noteworthy examples of the unkind satirical "mirror which flattered not," plaguy London.

[43] As Andrew Cunningham notes, the Platonic and NeoPlatonic tradition of the ancients "now came to be interpreted in a specifically Christian way by reference to certain biblical passages and expressions" (Cunningham 41).

[44] St. Isidore cited in David William's *Deformed Discourse*, 108.

While these archaic approaches were becoming somewhat outdated, at least according to Bacon, such notions remained typical of the satirical and much of the comparative anatomies of the period. Bacon took issue with the microcosmic debate because, as he explained,

> The ancient opinion that man was Microcosmus, an abstract model of the world, hath been fantastically strained by Paracelsus and the alchemists, as if there were to be found in man's body certain correspondences and parallels, which should have respect to all varieties of things, as stars, planets, minerals, which are extant in the great world. (Bacon *Maj Wks*: 208)

For Bacon, the body was a complex organism inhabiting a complex system: nature. In both macro and micro systems, Bacon intimated that one should not assume that one necessarily mirrors the other. Indeed, the mysteries of "this globe . . . seemeth to us a dark and shady body," wrote Bacon, yet only "in the view of God . . . [was it] crystal" (Ibid. 286). As shade was to crystal, the body was to the macrocosm; thus for Bacon, Neoplatonism was too simplistic a model for comparative anatomy. If anything, the Bacon's position "apocalyptically" undermined satirical Neoplatonism because the medical approach, which was further reinforced by Vesalius' illustrations, exposed a bodily structure that did not, in any way, resemble the macrocosmic structure.[46] Despite Bacon's and Vesalius' insights, however, early modern satirists remained determined to use the suspect comparative analysis to varying degrees. In appropriating the Neoplatonic method for his own satirical ends, even Thomas Middleton, a cynical anatomist, fancied himself a "*Micro-cynicon*" of sorts in his *Sixe Snarling Satyres* [1599].

---

[45] Robert Underwood, in *A New Anatomie*, [1605] for example, compared "*the Body of man: . . . 1 To a Household.* [and] *2 To a Citie*, as did Underwood's *The Little World. Or, A Liuely Description of all the partes and properties of Man* [1612]. On a more grandiose scale than Underwood's, John Davies of Hereford's *Microcosmos. The Discovery of the Little World, with the government thereof* [1603], Helkiah Crooke's *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man* [1615], Joshua Sylvester's *Micro-cosmo-graphia: The Little Worlds Description; or the Map of Man* [161?] and John Earle's *Microcosmography* [1628] paralleled the human body with the world-at-large.

Yet whether microcosmic or macrocosmic, the wealth of anatomies offered by satirical writers was largely non-empirical and ponderously moral. While the medical anatomist offered "empirical" truths of the human body, the satirist offered only grotesque moral truths. Everard Guilpin's *Skialatheia. Or, A Shadowe of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres* [1598] used the satire and epigram to convey so-called "truths" of human existence: the "lewd deformity" of a "folly-soyled age" (Guilpin 51 & 58). Predictably, satirical truth proved a "bitter" pill for the readership to swallow. As Guilpin put it, "The bitter censures of their Critticke spleens, / Are Antidotes to pestilentiall sinnes"; "some wanton words to blame" were the necessary moral prescription required, for "They are the language of an Epigrame" (Ibid. 61, 52 & 52).

Bacon recognized and complained that the satirist habitually responded to epidemics by misshapeningly anatomizing both the culture and the disease. Moreover, Bacon also recognised that deformity in humans was not always a sign of sin or evil as he argued in his essay, "Of Deformity." In fact, the reverse could be true as Bacon cited a list of "excellent [deformed] persons" including Socrates and Aesop among them (Bacon *Essays* 192). As did dissection, mapping of bodily form and function on a microcosmic level offered the potential of revealing hidden truths of human existence, because it would ultimately expose the vice and degeneracy of the flesh. In *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man* [1615], Helkiah Crooke explained the dilemma facing the anatomist this way: "there was onely one obstacle," and that was "to reueyle the veyle of Nature, to prophane her mysteries for a little curious skil-pride, to ensnare mens mindes by sensuall demonstrations, [which] seemeth a thing liable to heuy construction" (*MCM* 197). As Crooke suggested, the early moderns operated under the assumption that if one could unravel the complex mysteries of the human body one could likely repair the corrupt and permissive society. Like Crooke, the anatomist John Banister understood that "to discusse the secretes of nature, which [we]re so merualous in manns body . . .[wa]s the hardest point in Philosophie" (Banister A4). Both competing anatomies maintained that a comprehensive understanding of the microcosm promised unbounded possibilities. While the anatomists persisted in their empirical quests, satirists paraded opposing notions of the body, suggesting that the universal truths legitimate anatomists sought were misguidedly in vain, because, epistemologically speaking, the grotesque body and its soul were possessed by God alone.[47] In pushing the envelope of divine mystery, the satyr-anatomist sometimes offered cautionary warnings to his dissective competitors who, he believed, were treading on dangerous theological ground.

---

[46] See Gordon Teskey's *Allegory and Violence*, 110.

---

[47] In *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man* [1615], Helkiah Crooke spoke of the divine mystery which eluded the anatomist. According to Crooke,

> Whereas therefore there was no proportion or correspondence betweene mortality and immortality, betweene the Soule and the Body; nature with wonderfull skil, out of the principall part of the feede did extract and separate a spirit which lay lurking in the power of the Matter, a spirit I say of a Middle nature betweene Heauen and Earth, by whose mediation as by a strong band the diuinity of the soule might be married to the humanitie of the body. (*MCM* 428-9)

The Dangerous Truths of the 'New Anatomie'

While satirical anatomies began with the looking-glass, most writers transcended the critical gaze by symbolically penetrating the surface of the city and the body. Through the brazen efforts of the satirist and medical writers, anatomy had become a by-word for a scripturally informed and desperate, God-fearing culture. Like many of his contemporaries, the dissective gaze of Robert Anton allowed the poetical writer to "read an Anotomie lector of their vices" and vivisect "their grosse and sotish bodies," predictably arriving at the conclusion that these "basely vncapable" bodies were the source of London's pestilential frailties. This type of blaming was emblematic of plague satire as was the satirist's seemingly honest intentions (Anton C2).

Finger-pointing and laying blame on London's moral violators was a central concern of plague satirists. As Robert Gray and his satirical cronies would plead, sin brought the Lord's vengeance upon London, a typological point reiterated in Psalms, where the Lord was "an avenger of wrongdoing" (*Ps*. 99:8). Working within scriptural dogma, the satirist claimed, therefore, to be doing the Lord's work by spreading the hard doctrinal truth by anatomising "a large cittie, wholy inhabited with this damnable enormitie" (Nashe *Wks I*: 172). Epidemics were not simply outbreaks of disease, therefore, but part of the shame and scandal of infection: epidemics were divine vengeance of catastrophic proportions. In appropriating rigid patterns of biblical doctrine and either ignoring circulating theories of contagion or attributing them to divine causes, the satirist helped to sustain antiquated retributive notions of disease transmission into the popular imagination. By dismissing secular speculation as "a Discourse full of learned Simplicity," just as Defoe described it in his historical reconstruction of epidemic, *A Journal of the Plague Year* [1721], the satyr-anatomist insisted that pestilence was a discursive phenomenon with a lethal presence (Defoe 75). Following the severe epidemic of 1625, Thomas Fuller, a divine, fed his readers the satirical empiricism of the day. According to Fuller's experiential data, "experience tells vs daily, that there are some Diseases which grow vpon men meerely by their sinne and wickednesse" (Fuller 27). As Fuller and his contemporaries argued, early modern London was a culture facing a "real" crisis but with "imagined" divine causes. By eliminating sin, the satirist maintained London could eradicate disease.

Despite his rude rhetoric, the satyr-anatomist sometimes conveyed goodwill and cited moral objectives as the sole purpose for his anatomical investigations. In an apologetic tone somewhat inconsistent with other satirical anatomies, Robert Anton claimed in *Vices Anotimie, Scovrged and Corrected, in New Satirs* [1617] to "take no pleasure in the incision of other men" (Anton B7). But the discourse of plague is, of course, rife with such disclaimers. Indeed, the bold retractions did not prevent Anton or any of the other satyr-anatomists from incising their victims with a highly Marstonian *schadenfreude*[48] that did not conclude, as Marston declared, "till out his guts are torne" (*SOV* 73). Regardless of their doubtful gainsaying, the satyr-anatomist clearly enjoyed the dissective task at hand and indulged in all the perverse pleasures and grotesque possibilities the symbolic anatomy offered. In this grotesque interplay, "anatomy" was not simply an early modern buzz word for satire but a rhetorical method for dissecting the culture around him. Freud's dictum – "Anatomy is destiny"[49] – was both a persistent trend for the early modern satirist and physician and a guiding maxim for an age desperate to see an end to the recurring "pestilential visitations." As Benjamin Gordon has suggested, "The Renaissance of medicine began with anatomy," just as the Renaissance of satire began with symbolic or discursive anatomy (Gordon 748).

---

[48] John Marston's *Scourge of Villainie* [1599] offers perhaps the most violent and self-indulgent satirical anatomy of early modern London.
[49] Sigmund Freud quoted in Vicki Kirby's *Telling Flesh*, 75.

Satirical anatomies were more about constructing than dissecting: they constituted a moral enterprise operating under a façade of tragedy and veracity. Unlike legitimate anatomy, which sought to reveal the observed inner-truths of the body, the satyr-anatomist offered fictional rather than empirical truths. Under "tragic" and threatening epidemical conditions, the satirist claimed to reveal important grievous moral truths through tragic grotesque realism. While medical writers condemned the filth and decrepitude of London, satirists such as Thomas Dekker directed his abuses towards the effete state of London. Capturing the "true" "Horror of a Plague, the Hell," Dekker, for example, bemoaned in his ironically titled *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603] (*PPD* 82):

> Sorrow and Truth, sit you on each side of me, whilst I am deliuered of this deadly burden: prompt me that I may vtter truthfull and passionate condolement: arme my trembling hand, that it may boldly rip vp and Anatomize the vlcerous body of this Anthropophagized plague: lend me Art (without any conterfet shadowing) to paint and delineate to the life the whole story of this mortall and pestiferous battaile" (Ibid. 26).

Through a combination of "sorrow" and "truth," Dekker claimed to "paint without any conterfet shadowing," contending that his "art" had, in *fact* reconstructed a disturbing yet grotesquely valid picture of the plague: a grotesque vision that, according to Cyril Tourneur, had to exclude euphemism. As Tourneur reasoned, "Where shall I stand that I may freely view, / Earths stage compleate with tragic sceans of wo? / No meade, no grouve, whose comfortizing hew / Might make sad Terror my sad minde forgoe?" (Tourneur *Wks* 58). Composing the satirical anatomy was a melancholic and precarious vocation, but someone had to do it for the good of the culture.

Blaming others for plague, however, also put the anatomist at risk. As John Banister's dedication from *The History of Man, Sucked from the Sappe of the most approued Anathomistes, in the present age* [1578] read, "to the benefite of my Christian brethren, the godlie, and towards Chirugians of England" (Banister A4). Banister, like the physician and dramatist Thomas Lodge, who acted out of the Christian "duetie" and "love" he "owe[d] to this Citie," was representative of the pious tone of the anatomiser working within both the legitimate and the satirical mode (Lodge *Wks IV* 3). In *A necessarie and briefe treatise of the contagious disease of the pestilence* [1630], William Boraston similarly lamented: "pray for me Sinner the writer of this little Treatise, for to that intent I take the paines" (Boraston 32). Boraston and his contemporaries complained that anatomising the diseased city was a dangerous and painfully thankless task, and consequently, they demanded credit for their perilous and self-righteous plights.

Often, the seemingly genuine humility conveyed through the anatomy was a transparent one. As Thomas White, a professor of moral philosophy at Oxford warned: "God is true, and all men are liers" (White 70). Operating under the guise of truth, satirical anatomies were often deliberately deceitful and invectively abusive. While the humanist or more medically inclined intellectual would read Vesalius, Vicary, Bacon, Crooke or Banister, the more devout masses in search of moral truths could consult the satirical diatribes of John Davies of Hereford, Henoch Clapham, Donald Lupton, William Cowper, or Henry Holland. But where the serious anatomist engaged in natural philosophy and used empirical observation to substantiate his claims, the satirical anatomist employed imagination and a defamatory anatomy to condemn his objects of study. Though radically opposed in method, both legitimate anatomist and satirical anatomist dissected the plague experience towards the same end: a welcome end to disease and suffering.

For Robert Burton and many others, anatomy exposed a variety of bodily and social ills. Satirical anatomies, however, most often did not flatter or worship the body, but rather, condemned and denounced the seemingly "true" and "evil" nature of humanity. "As One read in deepe Chirurgery," wrote Dekker in *Lanthorne and Candle-Light* [1609], the satirists were prepared to "Draw'st on these Eu'lls," to reveal "the true Anatomy" (*RA* 185). Though described as "true" anatomies[50] with "real" matter, the satirical dissections were but discursive and metaphorical substances vivisected through ardent satirical imaginations.[51] As Dekker suggested, the trumped-up "Eu'lls" of the misanthropic body would be impossible to ignore or eliminate. To invert Dekker's comedy of the plague year of 1603, anatomised flesh more resembled "Im-Patient Grissill"[52] than healthy, patient flesh. While they offered their fictive imaginings as epistemological proof, they complemented their claims with a host of pious disclaimers. Consider, for example, Nashe's defense of his anatomy: "God is my witnesse, in all this relation, I borrowe no essential parte from stretcht our inuention, nor haue I one iot abusde my informations" (Nashe *Wks I*: 382). As one of the greatest abusers of the new anatomy, Nashe clearly anatomised in denial.

Along with canonical satirists such as Donne, Marston, Dekker, Nashe, and

---

[50] George Deux observes: "Truth in the Middle Ages is somewhat different to truth as understood by the post-Renaissance world: it is, one can perhaps say, a more literary truth, a truth which is more directly personal and more obviously didactic than that of an age which prides itself on scientific objectivity than detachment." See George Deaux's *The Black Death 1347*, 2.

[51] For more creative satirical writers like Stephen Egerton, entering the symbolic body with "the word of God" had a certain drill-like quality in Egerton's *The Boring of the Eare, Contayning a Discourse by way of Dialogue concerning hearing the word of God* [1623].

[52] I am drawing on the early modern notion of 'impatient poverty', by making a similar comparison to the impatient flesh of the sinner by negating the title of Dekker's play, *The Pleasant Comedy of Patient Grissel* [1603].

Burton, many other well-known and lesser-known writers also contributed to this "new anatomie,"[53] disseminating their investigations for any curious reader interested in their dissective explorations. Anatomy was not solely limited to the body but had wider cultural implications and was used to dissect a variety of social problems as well. This "new anatomie" vivisected baseness (John Andrewes' *The anatomie of basenesse* [1615]); sin (Anon.'s *The anathomie of sine* [1603]); folly (Henry Hutton's *Follies Anatomie* [1619]; vice (Robert Anton's *Vices anotimie, scourged and corrected in new satirs* [1617]); lovers' flatteries (Robert Greene's *Anatomy of Lover's Flatteries* [1584]); abuse (Philip Stubbes's *Anatomie of Abuses* [1583]); absurdity (Thomas Nashe's *Anatomie of Absurditie* [1589]); valour (Sir Philip Sidney's *Valour Anatomized, in a Fancy* [1581]); death (John More's *A liuely anatomie of death* [1596]); love (Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* [1596]);[54] the distressed soul (Bartholomew Robertson's *The anatomie of a distressed soule* [1619]); the mind (Thomas Rogers' *Anatomie of the Minde* [1576]); atheism (John Wingfield's *Atheisme close and open, anatomized* [1634]); wit (John Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* [1578]); urine (James Hart's *The anatomie of Urine* [1625]); and the more energetic John Donne anatomized the whole world (*Anatomy of the World* [1611]). Dekker's more humorous *The Ravens Almanacke* [1609} anatomised no less than twelve types of plague.[55] On the continent, Johan Oberndoerffer dissected physicians and quacks (*The anatomyes of the true phystion, and counterfeit mounte-banke* [1602]) while Vitus Jacobaeus busied himself anatomising the Protestant reformer Martin Luther (*The anatomy of Martin Luther* {1567]). By 1611, William Cowper had produced *The Anatomie of a Christian Man*. What separated Cowper from the vulgar satirists was his insistent focus on a moral exemplar. Where most satirists anatomised the "unChristian" man as immoral exemplar, exposing the sinful constitution of the body, as Wither put it, "With bad examples of thy Instigation," Cowper inverted the satirical process of the anatomy (*ASW* 259).

---

[53] From the title of Robert Underwood's *A new anatomie* [1605].

[54] See Gordon Teskey's *Allegory and Violence*, 38.

[55] Dekker wrote in *The Rauens Almanacke*,

> I finde therefore that 12. great and greivous plagues, shal especially fall upon the heads of this our English nation: and those are these viz": 'Saint Pauls plague'; 'Saint Chads plague'; 'Saint Benets plague' ; 'Saint Magnus plague'; 'Saint Trontons plague'; 'Saint Bridgets plague'; 'The wives plague'; 'The blacke plague'; 'The fryers plague'; 'The devils plague'; 'The Horne plague'; and finally, 'Gods plague'. (*Non-Dram Wks IV*: 188-92)

Emulating and appropriating the anatomical method, the satyr-anatomists manufactured "new" dissective works of their own. These were "new" anatomies of the plague experience which constructed morally deformed bodies within what the satyr perceived to be a morally deformed culture. In a quasi-Baconian poetics, for example, John Davies of Hereford fashioned a poetic "advancement of learning" of his own device. In *Microcosmos* [1603], Davies likened the starving poet to a cadaver. "How many Poets, like Anatomies," asked Davies," (As leane as Death for lacke of sustenance) / Complaine (poore Staruelings) in sadd Elegies / Of those whom Learning onely did advaunce" (*MC* 118). For Davies, it was anatomical poesy of learning and not anatomical dissection that would reveal the truth of the tragic human condition in time of plague.

In the spirit of pious truth, the satirist maintained plague that was London's nemesis -- the violent expression of God's anger and resentment at the city's sin -- a sacred disease unleashed upon a profane city. The intense social stresses and the accompanying religious crises inspired by epidemics motivated the satyr-anatomist to lash out in all the rhetorical savagery and apocalyptic fatalism he would become renowned for. Through satire and anatomy, writers attacked what they considered the various abuses responsible for plague: sin in all its carnal forms. Working within the religious ideologies of their time, satirists blended Christian myth with historical reality, interpreting plague as a divine affliction. Within this satirical mode, writers metamorphosed the city into a grotesque urban stage, just as Thomas Beard's *The*

Theatre of Gods Iudgements: Or, a Collection of Histories [1597] and Edmund Rudierd's *The Thvnderbolt of Gods Wrath Against Hard-Hearted and stiffe-necked sinners, or an Abridgement of the Theater of Gods feareful judgements executed vpon notorious sinners* [1618] constructed vengeful biblical histories by passing them off in embittered frankness as the darkest moments of London's legitimate social history. Allegorical histories of London which linked the city to biblical Israel, Sodom, Egypt, or even the Flood were especially in vogue. Tracts like Thomas Adams' *Englands Sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels* [1615]; Thomas Brewer's *The Weeping Lady: Or, London Like Ninivie in Sack-Cloth* [1625]; John Godskall's *The Arke of Noah, For the Londoners that remaine in the Cittie to enter in with their families, to be preserued from the deluge of the Plague* [1604]; Thomas Nashe's *Christs Teares Over Ierusalem* [1593]; and Francis White's *Dead Souls* [1619] explored some of the many allegorical possibilities the so-called interpretive "visitations" offered the London satirist.

For "The plague which otherwise would fall," explained Robert Greene, penance was the most popular collective medicine prescribed (Greene *Comp Wks XIV* 113). "Repent O London least, for thine offense" (Ibid. 113) was a common rallying cry of the more pious satirist. Similarly promoting the hysteria and phobic hatred of plague, writers like Robert Gray made their titles self-explanatory: *An Alarvm to England, Sounding the most fearefull and terrible example of Gods vengeance, that euer was inflicted in this world vpon mankind for sinne* [1609]. Such heavily didactic providential views of history left little to speculation or imagination because their typological accounts were scripturally grounded.

Guided by biblical typologies of pestilence, satirists anatomised both the urban and the human body, encoding each with moral, anagogic and even political[56] meanings. Plague discourse was, therefore, largely about satirical vengeance and the early modern satirist was the public voice of what René Girard has defined as “negative reciprocity’”: the tendency to explain and rationalise a social crisis like plague through moral causes.[57] Despite increasing evidence towards natural causes of plague, the satirist remained steadfast towards providentialist causes, pacifying the secular by arguing that God could work through natural causes to enforce his wrath.[58] “Aboue nature and secondarie causes,” argued Henry Holland, there was “a higher power, that is, I thinke, to speak with the Scripture, to the mightie hand of God” (*SPA* 17). As Donne explained in *Meditations XII*, “Nature” was God’s “immediate commissioner” (Donne *Maj Wks* 338), or in Spenserian terms, the Almighty was working through “great Dame Nature” to exact retribution (*FQ* II ii 6 2).

Consequently, the providentialism of the anatomy promoted “spiritual physicke” or metaphysical medicine over medicinal cures, as John Downame did in *Spiritual physicke to cure the diseases of the soule* [1600]. But, then, even licensed physicians who prescribed medicine to sufferers of plague and other infectious diseases also prescribed prayer along with their treatments. Largely misunderstood in a medical sense, plague was considered a divine retributive disease charged with a variety of mythological associations. In *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* [1963], F.P. Wilson cites four supernatural causes the early moderns linked to biblical plagues:

---

[56] Ben Jonson, in *Underwood*, for example, explored the political possibilities of the satirical body. In “An Ode to James Earle of Desmond, Writ in Queene Elizabeths Time,” Jonson politically dissected the feminized state itself. According to Jonson: “her {London’s} dead essence (like the Anatomie / in Surgeons hall / Is but a Statists theame, to read Phlebotomie” (Jonson *Comp Poems*: 163). In this work Jonson likened parliament to an anatomy theatre where politicians lecture on ‘bleeding’ the political body of the state. In Jonson’s semi-fictitious realm, politicians resemble satyrs who, in a sense, carve up England for their own partisan whims, literally bleeding the country and the city dry through greed and corruption. As Jonson intimated, unscrupulous politicians pursued not bodily truths in this anatomy, but false virtues just like the satyr, who stopped at nothing to achieve his bloody agenda.

[57] See René Girard’s *The Scapegoat*, 14.

[58] See Cindy Patton’s *Sex and Germs: The Politics of AIDS*; Nancy Siraisi’s *Medieval & Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice*, 8 & 9; and Keith Thomas’ *Religion and the Decline of Magic, 86*

> The plague was God's instrument for the punishment of sin. It was God's angel (2 Samuel xxiv 17), the arrow of God (Psalm xxxviii 2) flying through the air, the hand of God stretched out to smite the wickedness of men and cut them off from the earth (Exodus ix 15). (Wilson 3-4)

As Wilson suggests, plague could also be caused by "corruption of the air," "the planets," and "*Cacohymia,*" or humoural imbalance, but for the satirist, the divine origins of plague proved the most popular fashion for blaming the city for its own pestilential undoings (Ibid. 5-6).

During the early modern period, then, London not only suffered the ravages of plague, but also the invective abuses of the many satirists denouncing and anatomising the manifold sins of the city. While English anatomists like Vicary, Crooke, Banister, Caius, and Harvey physically dissected the sinful bodies of executed criminals, English satirists such as Lodge, Donne, Nashe, Hall, Jonson, Dekker, and many others, symbolically dissected the living cadavers of the city-at-large destined for infection, damnation, or, in the case of "Jacke Wilton" in *The Unfortunate Traveller* [1594], vivisection.[59] As Thomas Walkington explained in *The Optick Glasse of Hvmors* [1607], it took a revolting mind to dissect revolting matter, because he considered the anatomical prospect: "the signe of an abiect minde to beat our braines about necessaries for our vile corps" (*OGH* B4-5). This was, of course, as Walkington hinted, an ideal literary match: abject minds for abject bodies.

Through disgusting subject matter and his often unfeeling narrative distance from plague, the satirist sought reform through moral deformity. These were contrived anatomies not aimed at eliminating disease in a pathological sense but solely designed to reinforce the "truth" of their Christian *ars moriendi* message and their gruesome *memento mori* call to arms. While the anatomical pursuits of natural philosophy were beginning to reveal important physiological observations of the dead body, the satyr-anatomists remained unimpressed. Disconcerned with dissecting the dead, the satyr-anatomist fixed his moral gaze upon the living. The "new anatomy," for the satirist, meant not dissection but vivisection.

---

[59] In Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*, Jacke Wilton finds himself on the table of the vivisectionist Doctor Zacharies who was about to "cut [Wilton] like a French summer dublet" (UF*T* 131).

Satirical Vivisection and the Quick Anatomy

Unlike the dissections carried out in the name of natural philosophy, the dissections of satirical anatomies were disinterested in mimetic anatomy; theirs was not a symbolic dissection of a celebrated corporeal body, but a condemned symbolic body ritually dismembered within a discursive domain. Whereas comparative anatomists sought to understand the physical structure of the body through the "carkasse cut vp," satirical anatomists were primarily concerned with the body's animate moral fibre (Cotgrave A39). Indeed, few satirists, with the exception of Thomas Lodge, were medically inclined; but all were united in their concern for London's mortal vulnerability in time of plague. Textual proof of the satirist's vigilance in attempting to protect the moral purity of a city threatened by sin and disease is pervasive. These were meta-anatomies, symbolic vivisections of non-corporeal flesh and bones produced by visionary imaginations considerably removed from reality. In contrast to the legitimate anatomist, the satirical anatomist indulged in the subcutaneous parts of a grotesque discursive body he could both manufacture and cruelly dissect. The satyr anatomised "men with their bodies gashed" (*Jer.* 41:5), paradoxical bodies with the contradictory status of "living cadaver," because as even the physician, John Cotta, maintained,"men while they liue are alreadie dead" (Cotta A3).

As Wither suggested in *Abuses stript, and whipt* [1613], the satirist fashioned a disciplinary body he could vivisect, "To [make] feele the Torture of this earthly hell" (*ASW* 62). Yet despite the figurative violence of vivisection, satirists such as T.C. maintained: "no bodily weapon hurteth and hindreth men so sore, as the word of God"; scriptural truths meted out the greatest pains (T.C. B5). The trembling body was a deserving body, and, as the Book of Job bemoaned and T.C. reiterated: "Man [wa]s chastened with pain"; the satirist vivisected and inflicted pain with words, just as the Lord did (*Job* 33:19).[60] Human dissection, vivisection, and vengeful body mutilation were not as foreign as they might seem to the satirical imagination. The satirist drew his inspiration for bodily violence from a variety of scriptural passages.[61] The painful truths of his "cutting" words were best administered through grievous metaphorical methods. Though God remained the divine architect of the anatomy, as Dekker said to the Lord, "I holde you as a Surgeon," the satirist functioned as the Lord's surgical helpmate, a second in command for this grotesque and divisive enterprise (Dekker *Non Dram Wks IV* 217).

The living anatomy articulated by Thomas Swadling in *Sermons, Meditations, and Prayers, upon the Plague* [1636] reinforced the satirical hierarchy which reaffirmed God's position in the great chain of anatomy as the supreme dissector:

---

[60] In the Bible, there is good reason to fear the mortal pains of God's word. As God said in Isaiah: "I will look to the one who trembles at my word," (Isa. 66:2) the power of "divine" words could be strangely destructive.

[61] Some of the bodily mutations that appear in the Bible include a Leavite who cuts up his concubine's body in Judges 19:29; 20:26, beheadings arise in 1 Sam. 17:46, 1 Sam. 17:51, 1 Sam. 31:9, 2 Sam. 4:7, 2 Sam. 16:19, 2 Sam. 20:22, 2 Kgs. 10:6-8, Rev. 20:4; and gashed bodies emerge in Jer. 41:5.

> So long as God punishes you, hee gives you physicke: If he draw his knife, it is but to prune you; you are his vine. If he draw bloud, it is but to rectifie a distempered veine; you are his patient. If he breake your bones, it is but to set them straighter. If hee bruise you in mortar, it is but that you may breathe up a sweet favour into his nostrills; you are his handy worke: and if one hand be under you, let him lay the other as heavy as hee pleases upon you: let him handle you which way hee will, if hee does not throw you out of his hands, it is not matter. (Swadling 46)

As Swadling suggested, the divine anatomy was a necessary moral corrective, and as violent as God's dissective methods might have appeared, Swadling justified the Lord's vivisectionist tactics as vitally obligatory. In *The Teares or Lamentations of a sorrowfull Soule* [1613], Sir William Leighton similarly explained:

> He [God] like a good Chirurgion,
> Doth hurt to heale, they are his launces:
> That lett out our corruption,
> And so saues vs from worse mischances:
> Our plagues on earth saue vs from hell,
> Diuels wel may feare, for there they dwel (Leighton 148).

Taking their dissective lead from God himself, satirists followed in the Almighty's divine footsteps, or so they claimed. Satirical divines such as Donne, Marston, and Swadling envisioned themselves doing the Lord's work through anatomy; seeking often perverse answers from "a quicke bodie, but a buried will," as Samuel Daniel suggested in *Mvsophilvs* [1599] (Daniel 73). Some, like Robert Greene, "perfectly anatomised" the animate sins of youth in London didactically, so that the reader "might see euerie veine, muscle and arterie of her unbridled follies" in their grotesque splendour (Greene *Wks IX* 123).

As the scientifically-minded practised their art on the dead, the satirist executed his living anatomies on the quick. While anatomy had been censured throughout history, human vivisection was an even more taboo and repugnant project. Nevertheless, human vivisection likely occurred at some point and was figuratively *de rigeur* for the early modern satirist, as Donne suggested in "An Anatomy of the World," which explored the body "Alive to study this dissection" (Donne *Maj Wks* 208). Though much more highly articulate and sophisticated than most of his satirical contemporaries, Burton's Menippean satire on melancholy or depression, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* [1621], was in fact, as Robert Burton himself described it, "a living anatomy" (*AM Pt 1 Sec 2*: 230). To help justify his own symbolic vivisection of a depressed humanity, Burton argued that even "Vesalius the Anatomist was wont to cut up men alive" (Ibid. *Pt 1 Sec 1*: 130). Burton also cited Joseph Hall's *Characters of Virtues and Vices* [1608], which claimed to be "a living anatomy," consuming and reducing the body to *a skeleton . . . a lean and pale carcass*" (Ibid. *Pt 1 Sec 2*: 230). The anatomist Helkiah Crooke further supported Burton's vivisectionist claims on his own terms. As Crooke argued:

> I am not ignorant that some of the ancient Physitians, as Herophilus and Erasitratus, by the License of Princes whome they had possessed with the profit thereof, did anatomize the bodies of condemned wretches euen whilst they were aliue, which also in our age hath beene done by Carpus and Vesalius. (*MCM* 18)

If vivisection were good enough for Vesalius,[62] the satirist considered it good enough for his own symbolic method. The brilliant but short-sighted Burton did, however, fail to acknowledge that Vesalius was not the first anatomist to be accused of vivisecting human subjects. The ancient Alexandrian anatomists Herophilus [ca. 300 B.C.], the father of anatomy, and his rival Erasistratus [ca. 250 B.C.] held that distinction.[63] Following the lead of prominent ancient anatomists, the satirist explored the symbolic entrails of his own quick subjects in his own discursive mode.

---

[62] Crooke's claims were, of course, likely hearsay. If human vivisection did take place in sixteenth-century Padua, the practice was unheard of in early modern England.

Although legitimate anatomists had to confine their dissections to the winter months, satirists were somewhat less concerned about putrefaction and could anatomize year round. Unable to preserve the dead flesh, as no embalming fluids were available, decomposition set in quickly in the Renaissance anatomy theatre. By likening his own virtual anatomy to the actual, Donne expressed the expedient dilemma of his own symbolic vivisection this way: "So the worlds carcasse would not last, if I / Were punctuall in this Anatomy; / Nor smells it well to hearers, if one tell / Them their disease, who faine would think they're well" (Donne *Maj Wks* 217). The satirist, like the anatomist, according to Donne, had to dissect rapidly as the body rotted before him, as it did in Marston's living anatomy where the "maggot-tainted lewd corruption" of the flesh further animated an already volatile and unstable grotesque body (*SOV* 59). As Barnabe Barnes "romage[d] in the worm eaten keele of [a] rotten hulke" in *The Devil's Charter* [1607], the putrescent flesh of the living cadaver made the symbolic vivisection a truly repugnant prospect (Barnes V ii 3093-94).

Though graphically explicit anatomists like Crooke proudly "cvt up dead carcasses of men" (*MCM* 18), the satirical anatomy was made even more barbarous by the fact that it claimed to be executing a "liuing Anatomy of the body" (Forrester A6), an onerous enterprise to be certain. In his own symbolic vein, the Puritan poet George Wither's *Abuses stript and whipt* [1613], also indulged in the aberrant pleasure of dissecting the living: "'Tis him my newly-inspired *Muse* here tries," wrote Wither, "Whilst he is living to *Anatomise*" (*ASW* 12). The satirical anatomies performed on the living were, in the mind of the satirists, victimless vivisections carried out not for medical but didactic purposes. The anatomy's grotesque muse, the writhing symbolic body, was both the source and the target of the satyr-anatomist's desultory rage.

---

[63] See V. Persaud's *Early History of Human Anatomy*, 45.

By dissecting breathing beings, the satirist could expose the corrupting body quiddity of a sinner in action. The anatomising satirists reasoned they had, at the very least, a slim chance of morally reforming the living, since the dead were past help. Just as Aeschylus had written in *Fragments* [525-456 B.C.], "Pain lays not its touch / Upon a corpse" (Tripp 134), and Shakespeare would add in *The Rape of Lucrece*, one "cannot abuse a body dead," satirical anatomists performed vengeful dissections designed to mete out the symbolic pains and penalties it conveyed upon the living (*RL* 1267). The exterior vileness of "dirty" flesh and its putrid interior were best exposed through an anatomy where bodies were symbolically excoriated and violently disembowelled alive and kicking. An illustrative example of the grotesque living body flayed at the hands of the satirist can be located in John Davies' *Humours Heau'n on Earth* [1605]. As Davies put it:

> Here, in a corner fits an vgly Forme,
> That on the matter of a liuing Corse
> Finds matter of much mirth; which is, t'informe
> Himselfe of all the sinews, and their force;
> Who, with a knife, the flesh doth all deforme,
> To pull our nerues and sinews in their course:
> Which like strings, broken, hanging at a Lute;
> So hang these nerues the Body all about. (*HH* 162)

Unlike Vesalius or Vicary, Davies claimed to be perhaps more torturing than dissecting a "liuing Corse," a grotesque body not only in the process of decay, but more importantly, in the process of sinful life. Like a mangled "sinewy" instrument, with its "strings," "broken" and "hanging," this human "matter of much mirth," somewhat reminiscent of Vesalius' muscle men,[64] was flayed by the satirist with a sharp discursive scalpel, further deforming the already "deformed" flesh of the grotesque body. Yet in spite of the confessional mode of the disciplinarian satirist, whose descriptive lines "fetch[ed] a deepe sigh," the satyr-anatomist would prove equally capable of expressing even more violent perversities of quasi-Sadean proportions (Lyly *Wks II* 74).

Satyr-Masochism: Lashing the Naked and the Living Dead

While the satirists often attacked the lewdness of nudity, nakedness, in any anatomy -- satirical or physical -- was a necessary precondition for bodily division. Representative of the inquiring satirical spirit, Marston maintained that, "The naked truth [wa]s, a well clothed lie" (*SO V* 55). According to Marston's scheme, by first removing bodily apparel, the anatomist could ultimately edge closer to the truth yet nearer to degeneracy. As Marston contended, satirists ultimately disdained the "sumptuous clothes" which not only embodied greed and decadence, but obscured bodily truths (Ibid. 66). Longing for a return to their prelapsarian origins, the satyr-anatomists reasoned that Adamic nakedness might reveal Adamic origins.[65] Yet

---

64 I am grateful to Lesley Cormack for making this connection between Vesalius and Davies.

65 For Bacon, as Julian Martin notes, "the true and legitimate humiliation of the human spirit" would reveal the divine operation of things on earth, by recovering the "prelapsarian nakedness of mind." See Martin, Julian. *Francis Bacon, the State, and the Reform of Natural Philosophy*, 150.

nudity raised cultural anxieties in itself: as Revelations 16:15 declared, "blessed is he who keeps his garments that he may not go naked." While the "good" early modern Christians insisted upon concealing their nakedness, the anatomists were unrespectful to social decorum, and exposed their humiliated subjects nude. By shedding his subject's clothing, the satyr was that much closer to the essential Hobbesian state of nature, drawing nearer, he believed, to the elemental genesis of his sinful human guinea pig. As a symbolic anatomy, however, the clothing was nothing more than an allegorical shroud.

The undraped cadaver, as a subject of empirical inquiry, was acceptable and necessary for natural philsophy. But for the satirical anatomy, nudity was a more perverse mode of enquiry, as the satyr was not undressing cadavers but "quick" sinners. In this symbolic realm there was a perverse voyeurism at work for the satirist who defrocked his victims before eventually scourging and anatomizing them, enabling his readers to be "partaker[s] of strange sights" (Rowlands *Comp Wks I*: 3). If the anatomical inquiry was made rude or dirty, the satirist blamed not himself but the malignant state of his undraped subject, as Marston did in *The Scourge of Villanie* [1599], where he used his "idle rimes to note the odious spot / And blemish that deformes the lineaments / Of moderne Poesies habiliments" (*SOV* 60). In this satirical anatomy, Marston remarked that if his poetic livery appeared "blemished" and "deformed" it was mimetically fashioned by the grotesque state of his nude subject and not the satirst's own naked "genius." This deterministic view was reiterated by Wither in *Abuses stript, and whip* [1613], where truth itself became degenerately anthropomorphised. According to Wither: "I neither feare not shame to speake the Truth, and therefore haue nakedly thrust it forth without a couering" (*ASW* 8). The poet conveyed the anguish expressed by Paul in Galatians 4:16, where one can become the enemy by telling the truth.[66] Of course the rude and piercing subtext of "nakedly thrust[ing] it forth without a couering" was not indicative of scriptural authority, but of the phallic tradition of the shameless satyr personality. As Marston would agree, this was the "ruder hand" of the satirical anatomist at work (*SOV* 50). For Marston, Weever, and Wither, then, anatomical verse became, penetratingly -- perversely -- an unscrupulous and "pointed" search for the "naked truth."

Unlike the rational methods employed by legitimate anatomists, satirists wielded more torturous, and in some cases, masochistic metaphorical instruments with which to flay their victims. Whether using the surgeon's knife, the rod, the whip, the purge, or the rack,[67] the satyr-anatomist was consistently sadistic in his symbolic assault on the body.[68] Having set the quick sinner upon his discursive torture table, Marston's satyr-narrator W. Kinsayder warned "I'le strip you nak'd and whyp you with my rimes, / Causing your shame to live to after times" (*SOV* 99). Wither echoed Marston by threatening to "send abroad a Satyr with a scourge, / That to their shame for their abuse shall strip them, / And being naked in their vices, whip them" (*ASW* 261). Lashing the naked body via his discursive whip, Kinsayder claimed to be exposing the sinful truth of the corrupt flesh which would shamefully haunt the victim into eternity, a profound shame reinforced by Wither. Where John Weever preferred the "satyre's piss-steeped whip" in ***Faunus and Melliflora*** [1600], Marston's and Wither's lashes were more conventional but just as aversively brutish (Weever 1941: 95).[69] In these more degrading anatomies, as Weever's masochistic ritual intimated, while the satirist was angrily "pissed off," his subject was metaphorically "pissed on," a "defiling" act in and of itself.[70]

---

[66] According to "Paul's concern for the Galatians," Paul asks "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" See Galatians 4:16.
[67] See Alvin Kernan's ***The Cankered Muse***, 33.
[68] As Alvin Kernan would agree, this "sadism" is in keeping with the "satyr character." Ibid., 10.
[69] "Piss-steeped whip" also intimates that urolagnia or "watersports" might also have been part of ritual of the masochistic anatomy.

In addition to bringing nudity out of the early modern closet and into the satirical anatomy, Marston's anatomical theatre of cruelty in *The Scourge of Villanie* [1599] also set new sadistic standards of crudeness and ferocity. Satyrs were, as Marston confessed, "Lashing the lewdnes of *Britania*" (*SO V* 11). Unconventional by traditional standards of metaphorical dissection, Marston's whip or scourge provided a bizarre tool for vivisecting the naked, discursive body. The whip was also a particular favourite of both Wither and Weever. By "scourging" or lashing the body into its grotesque fragments, Marston and others composed a kind of sado-masochistic anatomy.

In 1601, likely roused by Marston, Weever published an entire series entitled *The Whipper Pamphlets*. In spite of the ironic title, *No Whipping, nor trippinge: but a kinde friendly Snippinge* [1601], Weever's satirical anatomy failed to spare the whip and further "snipped" and flayed his wicked subjects with lashing diction. Dekker likewise proposed in *Lanthorne and Candle-light* [1608], "flaying off their skins as I here propose to do" (Dekker 1968: 290). Wither seemed to follow Marston's, Dekker's, and Weever's leads in *Abuses stript, and whipt* [1613], scourging a body satirically degraded beyond recognition. Moral abuses were met with satirical abuse as the shame and humiliation of bondage and whipping of the sinner all-too-obviously demonstrated. In this discursive exchange, the anatomical subject's pain was the satyr's pleasure.

For Marston and most satirists, the body was a villainous, animalistic, and out-of-control vessel, and as such, was worthy of satirical discipline and the discursive scalpel. For the satirist, the rational animal had become an irrational animal, and was, therefore, worthy of the debasing oppression the satyr doled out upon it. Frequently bestialized by the satyr, the subject could resemble a muzzled dog or a "winsing Asse." In this degrading bestiary of abuse, figurative dissection was justified by Marston's narrator "Kinsayder" who rationalised: "The dog was best cured by cutting & kinsing, / The Asse must be kindly whipped for winsing . . . Whether thou be a mad dog, or a mankind Asse" (*SOV* 102). Like the "barking Satyrist" in his *Certaine Satyres* [1598], Marston's readership could also be reduced to the canine species (Marston *Poems* 66). Like the invited dogs of the anatomy theatre who were tossed the unwanted remnants of cadavers, Kinsayder's readers were summoned to "Gnaw pesants on my scraps of Poesie" from the "gauled hides" of his subjects (*SOV* 4). "Quake guzzell dogs, that liue on putred slime," bellowed Kinsayder, "Scud from the lashes of my yerking rime" (*SOV* 12). In *Certaine Satyres,* Marston's anatomy fashioned a literal "dog eat dog" milieu. And like the dog that returns to his vomit, the satyr-anatomist continued to resort to his regurgitating vivisections.

---

[70] In the characteristic "bawdy" discourse so favoured by the satirist, it is worth noting here that to, in fact, "defile" meant "to urinate upon." See *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays. Vol. 2*, 131.

Emulating, at times, the principled anatomist, Marston and those of his satyresque ilk claimed to "but striue in honest seriousnes, / To scourge some soule-poluting beastilines" (*SOV* 6). By cutting and "kinsing" the body in search of truth, "his honestie," claimed Marston's Kinsayder, "Shall be [made] as bare as his Anatomie" (Ibid. 15). Like other satyrs, Kinsayder was symbolically "Deuiding [the] indiuiduum" of his "thrice-turn'd bone-pick'd subject" in his own degenerate way (Ibid. 22 & 32). And while Marston wrote for the "vnseasond pallate," his grotesquerie of discovery wasn't about medical dissection but satirical vivisection (Ibid. 9). For Marston, Nashe, Wither, and Weever, the poetic anatomy was a grotesque intersection where cutting poesie severed tendons and broke bones within the anatomy's theatre of pain, shame and humiliation.

If nothing else, the symbolic anatomy proved a frustrating enterprise. No matter how hard the satyr-anatomist whipped, lashed, spanked, or shamed his audience through a series of violent moralizing anatomies, London remained unreformed, and plague continued to flourish. Caught up within the orgy of heathen perversities he claimed to attack, the satirist was consumed by the discursive bondage and discipline of his own invective anatomy. In allegorizing London into a foul and unhygenic anatomy theatre, the satirist too was simultaneously overwhelmed by, and overindulgent in, the conceptual gore of his Neoplatonic vivisections.

As the satirical anatomy documented, this discursive enterprise was more a spiritual and metaphysical ordeal than a medical gaze. With physiological anatomy tossed aside for religious speculation, the satirical anatomist conveyed so-called epistemologies under the satirical façade of grotesque realism. While plague-ridden London provided the ideal scene for the grotesque mode of the satyr-satirist, the verisimilitude of epidemic was regularly amplified to repellent extremes. With ardent imaginations and a suspicious anatomical method which invited deception, then, satirical anatomists were not pursuing empirical truths, but supernatural and moral truths. In this penumbra of speculation, satirical anatomies mirrored the vile bodily exterior while exposing the body's profane interior. This highly interpretive gaze meant that the ontological assault on the body was grossly balanced toward supernatural interpretation. The tactile explorations of a perilously alien interior revealed a perverse mystification of a body in physical and spiritual crisis. The satirical anatomy was, therefore, largely a dogmatic exercise, a theological physiology which reinvested the body with a less-than-divine biology.

As this chapter illustrates, the symbolic anatomies of early modern London offer a contextual impression of how the "living" anatomy was a disturbingly dominant trope for the Renaissance satirist. The anatomy of pestilence was, of course, not exclusively restricted to the plague body. On the contrary, before denouncing the abject state of the diseased body, the satyr-anatomist had first to define its healthier antithesis: the uninfected body. In exploiting the disease-free body as his moral barometer, even the healthy body suffered the invective wrath of the satyr-anatomist. While the uninfected body did not discharge or suppurate infection, it did, as Chapter Two will elucidate, evacuate its dirt and corruption, contributing to the physical and the moral filth of the early modern city.

Chapter Two

The Uninfected Body

Anatomising the Vile Healthy Body

Though the uninfected body was, by definition, free of plague and other infectious diseases,[1] it was, according to the satirical imagination, rife with repugnant humoural and excremental substances. The purpose of this chapter is to explore how the satirist represented the tragic "healthy" body *in media res* of epidemic. The satirical focus on the grotesque corporeal body meant that the soul and the spiritual body played a somewhat lesser role than they did in the anatomy of the infected body. In spite of being fashioned in God's own image (*Gen.* 1:26-7; 9:6), the human body, or "the glory of God" (*1 Cor.* 11:7) refashioned by the satyr was intrinsically foul in composition. From cradle to grave, the discharging body was in a process of decay, as it evacuated, flatulated, belched, regurgitated, digested, vomited, spat, cried, perspired, expired, and eventually decomposed. The satirist foregrounded bodily discharge not only to shame and debase the body, but to make bodily waste "matter" synonymous with human composition, raising phobic fears in the process.[2]

Often at his own professed peril, the satirical anatomist symbolically penetrated the body surface to expose its interior angst and to paddle through its grotesque recesses in order to reveal the disgusting status of the body. These reductionist anatomies would foreground not a human frame of flesh and bones but a physiology fashioned from turds and filth, for beneath its bubo-free exterior slushed an aversive mélange of bile, phlegm, blood, urine, ordure, tears, sweat, and saliva: "contained" substances which became "contaminating" substances once evacuated from the body.

---

[1] As Thomas Swadling argued, "health" worked "with nature," whereas "sickness" worked "against nature." In *Sermons, Meditations, and Prayers, upon the Plague* [1636], explained the dichotomy this way: "sicknes is; or, it is a want, a defect, a privation of health. It is not a thing in nature, but it is a thing against nature, a violation of nature: for therefore is sicknes called Disease, because it is *sine sanitate*, without health" (Swadling 22).

[2] As they were for the early modern satirists, "faeces" and "dirt" were the same repugnant substance (Rosebury 59). Mikhail Bakhtin also considered faeces "something intermediate between earth and body" (Bakhtin 175). The anxiety produced by "dirt," however, was best voiced in Marston's drama *What You Will*: "Dirt upon dirt, *fear* is beneath my shoe" [emphasis mine] (III ii 144).

Before anatomising the grotesque plague body, we must first redissect the healthy early modern body, that inherently corrupt mass of flesh perpetually prone to sin and disease, and moral, physical, and physiological filth. The first section of this chapter unveils the anatomical fashioning of a dystopian body for a dystopian city: how the body was made abject through metaphors of dung and evacuation. The stercorean identity of the body and its contaminating feculence are the focus of the following section concerning the excremental ontology of the healthy body. Next, the transforming metamorphosis of the abject ordure, the literal and the figurative possibilities of excrement upon unhygenic, dirty and smelly urban bodies are dissected. The confluence of malignant humours, defiling fluids and dysenteric entrails are examined in the following section for their threatening dankness. In the next section, the earthy filth and baseness of the body, its cloacal interior or self-befouling "privy faults" are considered for their defiling properties. The final section analyzes Donne's typological body -- an unclean vessel of dirt and dust -- a "vessel of dung."

Although the plague body was likely the filthiest and most deformed human frame fabricated and anatomised by the early modern satirical imagination[3] its healthier, uninfected inhabitants were also, as this chapter will argue, suspicious of similar polluting grotesqueness. It was the corporeal corruption of the body that the satyr-anatomists set their dissective sights upon. In so doing, the satirical anatomy refigured bodily matter as innately filthy and corrupt. Within the anatomy, the body's symbolic properties were conveyed in fleshy discourse as the corporeal texture of the body transformed into immoral matter.

---

[3] An even more repulsive body can be found in medieval constructions of leprosy, particularly with the lepers' association with lechery. See Saul Brody's *The Disease of the Soul: Leprosy in Medieval Literature*.

Corruption Incarnate: Satirical Bodily Matter

For early modern print culture, the body was often represented as a metaphor of an ill society.[4] By studying and understanding the fabric of the human body through its anatomy, both satirical and "scyentific" intellects reasoned that they might be able to unravel the mysteries of the cosmos-at-large. John Donne wrote: "we look upon nature, but with Aristotle's spectacles, and upon the body of man with Galen's, and upon the frame of the world with Ptolomey's spectacles," yet Donne recognized the limitations of the natural philosophical gaze (Donne *Maj Wks*: 373). Despite Donne's scepticism, other satirists continued "T'annatomize the Corps of Reasoning," to foster the possibility of establishing a healthier and more utopian world order – a new order which was a welcomed departure from the dystopian experience of plague -- or so a satirist like John Davies of Hereford believed (*HH* 205). For the satirical imagination, however, dissecting the metaphorical culture and the body's "republic" would not unveil some empirical utopian construct, but would rather simply reveal the dystopic antithesis of the perfect body (*ALC* I i 110). As Thomas Randolph declared in *The Drinking Academy* [1624] -- "by a metaphor / I am . . . fouler" -- the satirical "academy" of vivisectionists would reduce the body to the foulest of its "durtie" origins, metaphorically (Randolph II i 260-62). The satirist made apt use of the symbolic body to force his often scatological musings. Indeed, the period was marked by an all-out satirical *Scheißkrieg* against the Londoners -- a kind of Shrovetide battle that besmeared the populace with excrement and waste[5] -- an offensive denigration that reduced the populace to human "fraylties" of "dyrt and doonge."

---

[4] See Chris Shilling's *The Body and Social Theory*, 73; Susan Sontag's *AIDS and Its Metaphors*, 5; Sontag's *Illness as Metaphor*, 61 & 72.; and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By*, 191 & 193.

As the previous chapter demonstrated, Neoplatonic influences on the satyr-anatomist entailed anatomising both microcosm and macrocosm. The early modern satirist transcended the Vesalian parameters of anatomical realism by dissecting the grotesque body in a discursive symbolic domain. The satirist disembowelled and refashioned the early modern body in this virtual anatomy, because as he vivisected the satirical body "The dirt [inevitably] came out" (*Judges* 3:22). The satirist was, however, prepared for the task at hand for, as Sir James Harington confessed, "I know if I contend with dirtie foes, / I must be soild, whether I win or lose" (*MOA* 96). While the satirical anatomist fought a losing battle with the body, dissecting epidemics opened new or "meta" wounds which revealed the body's inherent and disgusting corruptness, an excremental corporeality which seemed to slip right through the writer's very "soild" fingers.

In a context where mass mortality was commonplace, it is of little surprise that the poet and explorer Sir Walter Raleigh contended that "our bodies are but the anvils of pain and diseases" (Raleigh *Wks I*: 54). Early modern "Bodies were" considered, as Jonathan Sawday suggests, "hostile entities in which people were forced to spend their days" (Sawday 36). Predictably, most satirists echoed the dictum from Romans 7:18: "nothing good dwells in my flesh," as this "enfeebled body" (*OGH* B5) was a material symbol of "our earthly wretchednesse" (Tourneur *Wks*: 66). As a flawed construct, then, vivisecting the living body in the symbolic anatomy was made disastrously messy and unpleasant by virtue of its excremental composition.

---

[5] Alain Corbin notes on the Continent that "Some scatological practices -- such as throwing excrement and waste, which was a feature of Shrovetide battles, or farting audibly, sometimes with accompanying gestures -- revealed the masses' desire to let off steam." See Corbin's ***The Foul and the Fragrant: Odor and the French Social Imagination,*** 214.

While the unhealthy body often dominated the satirical realm, a handful of writers defended the healthy body of London in spite of the high mortality rates. In *The Description of England* [1587] William Harrison's inclusive panorama, for example, not only examined London, but looked beyond the city walls. Commenting on"the General Constitution of the Bodies of the Britons," Harrison's selective bodily gaze intimated that English bodies were too healthy to succumb to war or plague (Harrison 444). According to Harrison: "Such as are bred in this island are men for the most part of a good complexion, tall of stature, strong in body, white of color, and thereto of great boldness and courage in the wars" (Ibid. 444-45). Harrison was rather dismissive of plague, but, then, he was no satirist either, simply a naive Baconian optimist with obvious nationalist tendencies. In a more objective vein, Sir Francis Bacon also exalted the more positive features of the "good" body and offered this comment: "The good of man's body is of four kinds . . . Health, Beauty, Strength, and Pleasure" (Bacon *Maj Wks*: 208). Despite Bacon's and Harrison's positive body constructions, the unflattering satirist undermined and besmeared both the humanity and the identity of the Londoner by deconstructing what Gabriel Harvey described as the disgust and "odious grossness" of the unhealthy or "bad" body (Harvey 50). While Bacon reiterated that "it cannot be denied but that the Body of man of all other things is of the most compounded mass," the body would remain a complex organism for the "scyentific" mind (Bacon *Maj Wks*: 209). For the satirical intellect, however, the body was pared down and condemned into "nothing but a *compound* of vncleannes," as Thomas Nashe forcefully maintained in *Christes Teares Ouer Ierusalem* [1593] (Nashe *Wks II*: 113; emphasis mine).

Within the sphere of the satirical anatomy writers were concerned with "the *matter* of a liuing Corse," as John Davies of Hereford suggested in *Humours Heau'n on Earth* [1605] (*HH* 162; emphasis mine). The satirist, therefore, melded the "domain of intelligible bodies" with the "domain of unthinkable, abject, unliveable bodies" (Butler xi), manufacturing a debased body in the process: a "continewall masse of corruption which alwayes stincketh, & is filthie, odious, and horrible," according to George Gascoigne (Gascoigne *Comp Wks II*: 218). The bodily substance of the satirical anatomy more resembled discharged "matter" than traditional "flesh" or pragmatic corporeal body matter. Embodied within this paradoxical and hybridized body of living death, flesh and blood metamorphosed into urine and ordure, pus and slime, and obscure "Minerals of baser quality" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks III*: 328). In the satirical realm, London was teeming with bodies of "Base hangers on, lusking at home in slime," according to John Marston's *The Scourge of Villainie* [1599] (*SOV* 91). While Marston took the grotesque body to absurd extremes -- "Fie thou shallow Asse . . . And marke me as I passe" (Ibid. 54) -- his condemning anatomy was indicative of an abject materiality, a materiality fiercely produced through a corporeal metaphysicality somewhat like the discursive paradigm Rachel Speght advanced in the subtitle of *Mortalities Memorandvm* [1621]. For Speght and the satirist, then, the early modern discursive body was "*imaginarie in manner*; [yet] *reall in matter*" (Speght 1) -- an undisciplined body encased in "bondage and corruption" (Bownd 172) -- a grotesque body that ignored boundaries while it oozed revulsion. In this moral grotesque, ill-"mannered" bodies were made manifest in excremental "matter" which abjectly mirrored their "dungy," immoral nature. The satirist had reduced secondary bodily "matter" into Aristotelian prime matter.[6] Not flesh or blood but dung.

By intermingling the "imaginarie" with the "reall," then, the satirical gaze fashioned a reductive and a misanthropic materiality, "a symbolic devaluation of the body,"[7] according to Michael Williams. In this "liuing anatomie" the excremental body more resembled a leaking vessel in the process of digestion, decay and putrefaction[8] than a healthy body. The mongrelized grotesqueness of an abject body composed of discharged matter transformed the early modern body into a dirty construct, both in the literal and the figurative sense of the term. The abject nature of bodily ordure was not entirely contained within satire alone but spilled over into the medical realm. Indeed, for a physician and anatomist like William Harvey, body matter was "compound" and "composite," "corruptible" and in a state of "concoction," and, as Harvey intimated: "where there is concoction there the residue is excrement" (*ALH* 107 & 101). But what was "residual" ordure for Harvey, was "compound mass" for the satirist. Excretia was not simply the dregs of bodily waste but the atomic essence of bodily mass dissected in the satirical anatomy, as John Donne mentioned in "Devotions 2": "he that hath no grave, but a dung-hill, hee that hath no more earth, but that which he carries, but that which he is" (Donne *Sel Prose*: 94). Thus, the expeller became the expelled, as Kristeva's conception of the abject "waste-body, corpse-body" cogently illustrates.[9]

---

[6] Peter Angeles defines "prime matter" as "matter in a state of pure potentiality devoid of any properties or characteristics (whose only 'property' may be said to be not having any property)." See Angeles' *Dictionary of Philosophy*, 163.

[7] See Michael A. William's "Divine Image – Prison of Flesh" in Feher's *Fragments for a History of the Human Body Part One*, 143.

[8] Neil Rhodes discussed the putrefying body as an entity that metamorphoses for the worse. According to Rhodes: "The malleability of his flesh, its capacity for decomposition, makes this 'gorbelly Host' a victim of the grotesque truth that human bodies have a disturbing tendency to resemble, then become, rather baser matter." See Rhodes's *Elizabethan Grotesque*, 48.

[9] Julia Kristeva put forward the thesis of the "waste-body/corpse-body" in *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*: "It is no longer I who expel" writes Kristeva, "'I' is expelled." See Kristeva's *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, 4 & 108.

Through the "imaginarie" corporeal paradigm constructed by Speght and her satirical contemporaries, discharged matter constituted the foremost share of the "reall" matter of the satirical anatomy. Typically, however, the satyr-anatomist was prone to grossly distort the balance and the borders between human tissue and human waste.[10] This emphatic scatological construction foregrounded body feculence, or "Yon Tissue slop" of these "dumbe creatures," that John Marston and Nicholas Bownd refashioned (*SOV* 73 & Bownd 172). Like the angry satirist, John Webster's vengeful "Bosola" in *The Duchess of Malfi* [1613] offered his own "rough-cast phrase to . . . [this] plastic" mass (*DOM* II i 34-5). Bosola argued upon the anatomical stage of Southwark, for example, that the body exterior was a deceptive façade, simply "A rotten and dead body, we delight / To hide it in rich tissue" (Ibid. II i 60-1).

In their rather anal fixation with social, moral and physical filth, many anatomising satirists cast scatological aspersions upon London and its inhabitants, rubbing their readers' noses in the abject "dregs of [their own] corruption," to quote John Downame's *Spiritual physicke to cure the diseases of the soule* [1600] (*SPT* 19). Fear and loathing of the body was reinforced through the excremental vision. Simply put, the anatomical gaze of the satirist was intended to scare the reader shitless.[11] These were particularly threatening texts because "Excrements and its equivalents (decay, infection, disease, corpse, etc.)," as Julia Kristeva notes, symbolised "the danger to identity that c[a]me from without . . . [a] society threatened by its outside, life by death" (Kristeva 71). The faecal body fashioned through the anatomy was a lethal body circulating, recycling, and putrefying in its own Swiftian muddy essence; a body besmeared and besmearing.[12]

---

[10] Again, in *The Powers of Horror* Julia Kristeva articulates: "If dung signifies the other side of the border, the place where I am not and which permits me to be, the corpse, the most sickening of wastes, is a border that has encroached upon everything . . . The border has become an object" (Ibid. 3-4).

[11] The visceral repugnance of a body deformed and misshapen by its excremental essence was a popular satirical construction. As Sir John Harington suggested, this was a fearfully monstrous construct with a dysenteric impact, for "every time you looke on him, you are so frayd that you have need of a close stool" (*MOA* 260). Fortunately, the redeeming qualities of some of the poorer quality texts was founded upon the material fact that they offered didactic horror and entertainment. When John Norden complained "like stinking filthie cloath / my life appeare to thee" (Norden 36), he was likely comparing himself and sinful Londoners to soiled bumfodder.

But it was not just the vulgar satirists like Sir John Harington, who did all the muckraking by offering a "noisome view of our lothsomest excrements" (*MOA* 83). Indeed, even more sophisticated dramatists like Shakespeare could "spread the compost / To make them ranker" (*HAM* III iv 151-52). In fashioning the body's excremental deformities, satyr-anatomists foregrounded the freakish abjectness of a symbolic bodily interior and exterior that disrespected borders between filth and cleanliness, purity and impurity. The scatological satirical body occupied, as Kristeva argues, an "in-between . . ., ambiguous . . ., composite" state that "disturb[ed] identity, system, [and] order" (Kristeva 4). In its coterminous state between the imaginary and real, the body was a corporeal medium of "crude matter – subject to mutilation, disease, inevitable decay," a body that "shared in the instability of all matter, all bodies."[13]

In "this liuing body of death," described by the anatomist Helkiah Crooke, the body was both waste and corpse, a paradoxical body composed of abject death and dirt (*MCM* 61). As it did in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* [1593], the anatomised "body" became "a swallowing grave" (*VEN* 757), a grotesquely self-consuming and fearfully mortal construction; a "fleshy prison of base sinne" both deadly and devouring (*SSA* 40). Gascoigne similarly recorded the decay of the "vile unworthinesse of mans estate and condicion" in a scatological collusion where

---

[12] In several lectures on disgust and the Renaissance, Jonathan Hart elaborated on how Swift's "Yahoos" were a literal incarnation of the excremental vision in satire.

[13] See Michael A. William's "Divine Image - Prison of Flesh" in Michel Feher's *Fragments for a History of the Human Body Part One*, 140-41.

"man bringeth forth nitts, lyse & worms" and "maketh excrements of spettle, pisse, and ordure" (Gascoigne *Comp Wks III*: 221). To use Harington's pun, these were the body's "privie faults" (*MOA* 183) which persistently befouled "the vile mansion of [the] body" (*OGH* C3).

Anatomising the recurring "pest" of London was a "soild" venture because it entailed anatomizing the city's filthy inhabitants and "the dirtie paines those Citizens take" (Jonson *Comp Poems*: 195). As most satyr-anatomists would agree, the metropolis and its sinful denizens were excrementally inseparable. Throughout much of the discourse, the Neoplatonic impulses of both satirical and comparative anatomists consistently illustrated that the city and its inhabitants mirrored one another.[14] The ordure-infested macrocosm, it seemed, had its corresponding microcosm. Like Dekker's unhygenic city "drownd in gore" (*PPD* 91), the body was aspirating in its own steaming feculinity; in its own "excrementall vapors, & afrighting deadly dreames," London was a dystopian city festering with dystopian citizens (Nashe *Wks I*: 357).

Bereft of the odour of sanctity, the "whorson sawcie stinke" of the body augmented its paradoxical status (*MOA* 160). Satirists anatomized a living "corps" (*ALC* I i 41) "of putrid flesh alive," (Jonson *Comp Poems* 158) noisome "with grosser fuming vapours" (*OGH* H2), an animate cadaver which lingered in a city where grotesque "bodies, meet like rarified ayre" (Jonson *Comp Poems*: 213). Jeffrey Henderson, for example, notes that the stench of the grotesque body and its a pungent bouquet of waste matter and putrefaction was synonymous with death.[15]

---

[14] As the title of Underwood's tract suggests, *A New Anatomie. Wherein the Body of man is very fit and aptly (two wayes) compared: 1 To a Household. 2 To a Citie [1605],* Underwood's 'looking-glasse' on London fashioned a distinctly excremental human silhouette (Underwood 1 & 40).

[15] Jeffrey Henderson discusses the relation between excretion and death most poignantly. As Henderson suggests: "Excrement, urine and farts have strong smells which belong generically with the smells of rotting flesh and vegetation; they are death smells and as such are considered bad, as are all the activities involving the organs of excretion" See Henderson's *The Maculate Muse: Obscene*

Most, if not all, writers in this study would acknowledge, the "noisome stench" of death and excrement would have been particularly dominant during summer epidemics. Yet amongst the smell of death, the "shitty" lives of those left behind continued to prevail.

Through the pens of Nashe, Dekker and their contemporaries, the grotesque satirical mode[16] of the anatomy reinforced the excremental vision of "living death" to often disgusting extremes. With their misanthropic maxims, satirical writers attacked the human follies of Londoners, besmearing the social collective with their vehemently antihumanist diatribes which anatomised and refashioned bodies out "of some coarse mould," a grotesque configuration of common clay and earthly detritus encased in excremental flesh (*ALC* IV i 98). Scatology and disgust shaped not only the plague body, therefore, but the seemingly healthy, uninfected body was equally deformed and ultimately shamed in print. Through the grotesque realism of the anatomy, the distorted bodily sphere had many of its vital organs removed and the disgusting contents of its slimy cavity replaced with excrement.

Morally misshapen and inherently excremental in substance, London's plague-free populace found itself under the coprophilic gaze of vivisecting satirists who employed human dung as the poetic mortar of the body: inferior bodily poesy "peest with *Ouids* excrements" (*SSA* 14). As Kelly Anspaugh reminds us, "the turd" functioned as "the satirist's master trope" (Anspaugh 75). With their septic stick in hand, satirists fabricated an excremental ontology for the uninfected body, redefining its abject status in a discursive realm where, according to Deiter Rollfinke, "life d[id] not simply resemble excrement, life [wa]s excrement" (Rollfinke 194).

Language in Attic Comedy, 54.

[16] This term is from David Worcester, who discusses "grotesque satire" in general terms, whereas this study examines the specifics of grotesque satire in the early modern literature of plague. See Worcester's *The Art of Satire*, 60-70. Leonard Feinburg also uses the term to explain how such satire transcended decorum. See Feinburg's *Introduction to Satire*, 63-65.

Hardly surprising, therefore, that many physicians treated plague with a bottoms-up model, prescribing plague suppositories "to be taken in at the fundament, and kept till it move a stool" (Mullett 110).

In this excremental morphology, the satirist claimed to reveal the aversive truth, the "dunghill of flesh" (*EMI* II iii 8) that lay hidden beneath a "dung-clad skin" (Hall *Coll Poems*: 88) where, adds William Miller, "the inner body was nothing but excrement and slime" (Miller *Anatomy*: 52). Like a walking jake of piss and shit, London's leaky vessels discharged not only themselves but their sins upon London. Despite Robert Burton's own grotesque medical conception of "Flesh . . . soft and ruddy, composed of the congealing of blood & c" (*AM Pt 1 Sec 1*: 131), the more orthodox satirist dissected a body of congealing ordure. In this sense, the skin more resembled the shit sack, which Martin Luther described earlier in the sixteenth century. Luther, in a characteristic moment of self-abjection, turned the turd upon himself, just as he did with the victims of his invective. In his unaptly titled *Table Talk*, the scatological reformer compared himself to a summer's turd. "I'm like a ripe freck [shit] and the world's like a gigantic arschloch [asshole]."[17] If Vesalius was the "Luther of Anatomy"[18] Luther was the Vesalius of scatalogia who positioned himself in a most feculent realm. The theologian's unflattering bodily debasement would prove popular across the channel where English writers, including Sir Thomas

---

[17] Martin Luther's *Table Talk,* cited in Martin Pops's "The Metamorphosis of Shit." *Salmagundi* (Spring 56, 1982), 29.

[18] See A.M. Lassek's *Human Dissection: Its Drama and Struggle*, 91.

More[19] and John Vitalis,[20] seized the ordurous metaphor for their own scatological ends. As Elizabeth Charlotte of the Palatinate would say later in the seventeenth century, "If you think you are kissing a pretty little mouth with all white teeth — you are kissing a shit mill"; Luther's scatological sphere of influence would continue to spread not only on the continent, but especially in the "soild" pens of English satirists (Dundes 64).

In addition to his "shit sack" metaphor for the body, Luther also likened the human body to a "Laugensack, or bucking cloth, a washing utensil consisting of a porous cheeseclothlike sack filled with lye . . . made from . . . stale urine or cow manure" (Rollfinke 4). In this scatological digression, Luther considered the body a sort of excremental filter "through which," he argued, "flow[ed] nothing but nasty sweat, urine, spit, and more effluences than it has members" (Ibid. 4). In *Svmmers Last Will and Testament* Nashe used a similar Lutherean metaphor: "I am the very poore mans boxe of pitie" resembling a "siue, or a dust-boxe" (Nashe *Wks III*: 261). As the satirical imagination demonstrated, the macrocosm was inhabited by "Philpots": a populace not only over-filling the macrocosmic chamber pot, but full of shit.[21] These were the evacuates incarnate of London whose collective propensity to sin inspired the satirist to besmear Londoners in their own wretched filth. Unlike Jonson's "Subtle," who rescued "Face" in *The Alchemist* [1610] and had "ta'en thee, out of dung, / So poor, so wretched when no living thing / Would keep thee company, but a spider, or worse" (*ALC* I I 64-66), the satirist refused to extract any humanity out of its excremental essence and, therefore, abandoned the anatomised body to the "dunghill of abject fortune."

---

[19] Sir Thomas More's debate with Martin Luther set new invective standards as each writer waded into the fetid depths of scatology. In *Responsio Ad Lutherum*, More wrote to Luther:

> for as long as your reverend paternity will be determined to tell these shameless lies, others will be permitted, on behalf of his English majesty, to throw back into your paternity's shitty mouth, truly the shit-pool of all shit, all the muck and shit which your damnable rottenness has vomited up, and to empty all the sewers and privies onto your crown divested of the dignity of the priestly crown. (More *Comp Wks V*: 311).

[20] Similar to More's attack upon the Protestant Luther, Vitalis' "Poem on Luther" voices similar scatological sentiments. "Hurrah! Shower him with festal shit, honor worthy of the man who is shamefully overcome and triumphs himself as victor with his own mouth." Vitalis cited in More's *Complete Works V*, 695.

[21] See James T. Henke's *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays Vol. 2*, 229.

In *The Purple Island* [1633] Phineas Fletcher dissected a discontent and incontinent "bodie . . . fram'd of earthly paste, / And heavie mold; yet earth could not content him" (Fletcher *Wks II*: 158). As Fletcher elucidated, even his "purple" body was constructed out of discursive "matter" based largely on grotesque material "matter," namely body effluents. By "terrifying the beholders with frightfull shewes of inquietude & anxietie, deliquation, sodaine and violent euacuations and exagitations of the whole body," even the physician, John Cotta, was not above hyperbolising the excremental angst of the satirist (Cotta D1). Similarly, Robert Burton, in his Menippean satire, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* [1621], spoke of the "superfluous excrements, and the reliques of meat and drink" (*AM Pt 1 Sec 1*: 136), excrements that were "expelled" and not always controlled by bodily "sphincters" (Ibid. 132). If the eyes were the windows to the souls, the sphincters were the portholes to "the manifold Conflicts, Tumults, Broils, and Uproars in the Body Natural" (*LPA* 44) of these "venting" [or defecating] bodies (Henke 1974: 308).

Luther's influence upon English satire meant that satyr-anatomists also drew upon "a disordred hayle-shotte of Scriptures" to help fashion and dissect their excremental subjects (Nashe *Wks II*: 124). In *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* [1596], Sir John Harington, for example, cited "the blessed Apostle S. Paule, being rapt in contemplation of divine blisfulnes, compares all the chief felicities of the earth, esteeming them (to use his own word) as *stercora*, most filthy doung, in regard of the joyes he hoped for" (*MOA* 88). As Harington's scatological interpretation of St. Paul suggested, the world was an excremental cosmos. Within the dungy satirical genesis of bodies, then, one's ontological status was typically redefined excrementally.

Manufacturing an Excremental Ontology or Botties That Matter

At his best, the satirist was a bodily revisionist and, at his worst, he was the aberrant fabricator of a morally grotesque and abject physical body. Despite the health of the natural body, like the infected body, it was regularly exploited through "abiect scorne" as an immoral exemplar, its transgressive sins helping metamorphose the body into foul matter: a recyling receptacle of filth (*SOV* 23). The recycling of urine had profound implications in time of plague. Although the early modern Spanish apparently brushed their teeth with urine,[22] some Londoners took to drinking it during epidemics. In the words of George Wither from *The History of the Pestilence* [1626]: "some constrayned / To drinke their Vrine, when they drought sustain'd," piss was considered a curious plague prophylactic (*HP* 13). Even the foaming "flapdragon" of Elizabethan times, for example, meant drinking to one's own health in urine (Rosebury 123). It was the poor, however, who were the most likely candidates for urinary ingestion, because those who could not afford more quality plague medicines were recommended to "drink twice in the day a draught of their own urine" (Slack 1992: 31). As Nashe put it: "To desperate diseases must desperate Medicines be applyde," plague prevention was often a distasteful venture (Nashe *Comp Wks II*: 20).

By foregrounding the body's effluential discharges -- excrement, urine, vomit, sweat and spit -- this rhetorical vivisection, though far from empirical, foregrounded the gross physicality of the body for didactic purposes, metamorphosing the body into what Lawrence Kubie describes as a "curious dirt factory" (Kubie 391) or what we postmoderns would likely call a walking "crap factory." Bodily effluents like "urine and ordure, that which we carie about us," were, as Harington suggested, "a good speculation to make us remember what we are" (*MOA* 161). By reinforcing the excremental means of production, the body resembled a human privy and like Harington's jake, the profane body "was scurrill, base, shallow, sordidous; the dittie, the dirge, the etymologie, [and] the pictures, gave matter of jest, of scorne, of derision, of contempt" (Ibid. 208)

---

[22] Bruce Boerher cites Erasmus' *Manners 227* for this curious custom. See Boerher's *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal*, 151

Somewhat like Swift's infamous dung-scientist at the Academy of Lagado from *Gulliver's Travels* [1726] whose own hands were "dawbed over with Filth," then, the satirist was drenched in the excrement of the anatomy (Swift *Writings*: 153). But where the dung-scientist attempted to render excrement back to its origins -- food -- the satirist traced the body to its quasi-biblical origins: excrement. Within this dungy aetiology the satirist shared his esoteric knowledge of the body with his readership. What the satirist offered was a genetic fallacy -- a stercorean identity -- a grotesque by-product of his mythical thinking.

Few Londoners, however, would have shared the views of Paracelsus' or Swift's fictitious dung-scientist that "Man's dung, or excrement, hath very great virtues, because it contain[ed] in it all the noble essences, viz: of the Food and Drink."[23] On the contrary: in this excremental vision, "shit" was always "ordure," a term derived etymologically "from the Latin *horridus*, [and] 'horrid', from *horrere* to shudder."[24] For the early moderns shit was an abject and melancholic reminder of sin and death.

---

[23] Paracelsus is cited in Theodor Rosebury's *Life on Man*, 159.

[24] See Kelly Anspaugh's "The Powers of Ordure: James Joyce and the Excremental Vision(s)." *Mosaic* 27/1 (March 1994) 84.

Human ordure remained repulsive "shit" and no physician, not even Paracelsus, was about to change that fact. Like Harington's narrator "Misacosmos," London satirists claimed to be "hater[s] of filthinesse" (*MOA* 80). Although Harington indulged in the anatomy of the dreaded privy, for example, he still spoke unaffectionately of "a most filthie Jakes . : . infectious with the horrible viled savour" (Ibid. 133). Through his improved privy design, Harington intended to improve the sanitary state of London and he used the disgust of inadequate sewage disposal to force his point about filthy humanity. Harington professed that ordure's unwanted presence in the privies and kennels continued to offend even the most tolerant sensibilities of the early modern Londoner. Human dung remained universally repulsive, the "digestions filth (which kind abhorres)" (*MC* 70), wrote John Davies indelicately. Excrement was anything but Bakhtinian "gay matter," because the English satirist hurled the dung of the anatomy in anger, not in fun; not in good taste but in bad (Bakhtin 335).

Within the satirical anatomies a radically new bodily ordering and classification system emerged. Vivisecting a body classified through scatological stigmata, the satirist reinforced the body's polluting force which often converged it with contemporary natural philosophical perspectives. As Rachel Speght concluded in *Mortalities Memorandvm* [1621]:

> Then is the bodie, which with filth is fraught;
> Witnesse the sinkes thereof, through which doe passe
> The excrements, appoynted for the draught,
> Euacuations, loathsome in their smell,
> Egested filth, vnfit for tongue to tell. (Speght 16)

Speght's repellent view was shared by the legitimate anatomist of the Great Plague [1665], George Thomson, who also described the prominence of "degenerate Matter conceived within the Body" (*LPA* 8). The satyr-anatomist, of course, offered the ultimate in Vesalian alternatives by vivisecting a grotesque structure where body by-product replaced bodily physiology in "a dirty coagulation" (Ibid. 74). Where dirt was usually "the by-product of a systemic ordering and classification of matter," as Mary Douglas suggests, dirt or dung became the crowning bodily matter of the healthy, grotesque body (Douglas 35). For satirical writers, this "matter out of place" symbolically displaced bodily matter with dung, or what Sir John Harington called "contemptible matter" of the first order (*MOA* 89).

In his *Certaine Satyres* [1598], John Marston loosely defined the satirical gaze of the anatomised body as a "queere substance, worthlesse, [and] most obsurd" (Marston *Poems* 68). But more than just "queere," "worthlesse" and "obsurd" the body was excremental in essence as John Woolton, Sir Walter Raleigh, and William Cupper would reconfirm. Woolton hinted at the turdish essence of humanity in *A Newe Anatomie of whole man* [1576] when he referred to "the whole masse of lumpe of man" (*ANA* C1), or in Sir Walter Raleigh's words: "this lump of imperfect matter" (Raleigh *Wks I*: 10). Edward Hake would argue that the lumpy bodies of epidemic were threatening and condemning bodies -- "Most ugsome shapes, and creatures, such / as I can not define" – bodies of angst and abjection that often defied explication (Hake E5).

For the more scatological satirists like Donne, Marston, Nashe, Harington and Jonson, London's populace more resembled -- to bowdlerize Butler's metaphor – "botties that mattered." By reducing the body to a grotesque excremental construct, satirical anatomists undermined the teleological paradigms of Galen and Aristotle[25] which viewed the body as a complex organism. The grotesque mythos of the satirist displaced the secular logos of humanism preached by Sir Thomas More, among others. In the satirical realm, the human-centred universe of the Renaissance devolved into an feculent cosmos inhabited by a feculent humanity of "unwholesome and uncleane bodies" (Ewich A21). Though excremental in substance, the body also remained fragile; a kind of brittle brown glass according to John Moore's *A mappe of Mans Mortalitie* [1617].[26] "Manur'd by lewd Precisians" (*SOV* 22) through the local colour of satirical wit, as John Marston indelicately put it, London's populace took on a tawny hue in time of plague. "Circes thynne monsters painted out the hue," reaffirmed Thomas Bastard, "Of fayned filthinesse, but ours is true" (*CSB* 181). In *The Scourge of Villainie* [1599], John Marston concluded that it would have proved a futile and hypocritical exercise to attempt to sugar-coat such a shitty city. He warned: "Paint not a rotten post with colours rich" (*SO V* 103). For Marston and Bastard, then, true filthiness defied euphemism and as the anatomy would articulate, the delusive exterior could not ultimately obscure the filth within.

---

[25] See David Hoeniger's *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*, 72.

Mapping the Excremental Exterior: The Abject Ordure

For the satirist, the symbolic anatomy was the foremost method for separating the deceptive exterior from the body's excremental interior. Jonathan Sawday suggests that this type of analysis created a "confrontation between the grotesque and the classical" (Sawday 19). As R.C. put it in *The Times Whistle* [1615]: "And faire indeed they are to outward eyes" (R.C. 50); the exterior gaze was a limited perspective for it could "not discerne inward deformities" (Ibid. 50). Nevertheless, many satirists began their anatomies by surveying the grotesque body landscape. *A mappe of Mans Mortalitie* [1617] by John Moore, was typical of the satirical mapping of the excremental body exterior, a paradigm which suggested that the body was little more than "a filthy dunghill, couered with snow, faire without and foule within" (Moore 43). William Cupper's *Certaine Sermons* [1592] further transcended Moore's account by arguing that the "natural" filth of humanity was as dirty as any filth could possibly be. According to Cupper: "there [wa]s no dust or excrements vnder our feet there [wa]s no filth in the kennell, no mud and durt in the streete, no soyle on the dunghill, more fowle and filthy then we our selues are by nature" (*CSC* 32). Thus when William Bullein's character "Avarus" from *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578] and Dekker's "Fryer Pedro" claimed to "smell a padde in the Strawe"[27] they were merely expressing the excremental presence of the average Londoner "Bedded and Bath'd in all his Ordures" (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 358). Donne and many other satirical writers attested that the collective lapse in hygiene and sanitation mirrored the filth of the average Londoner. Even the healthy body emitted an excremental odour in an age where cleanliness was primitive to say the least. Queen Elizabeth, for example, bathed only once a week.

---

[26] John Moore posed this rhetorical question regarding the body: "What glasse is so brittle and subiect to knockes and breaking as this body of ours?" See Moore's *A mappe of Mans Mortalitie. Clearely manifesting the originall of Death, with the Nature, Fruits, and Effects thereof, bothto the Vnregenerate, and Elect Children of God* [1617], 43.

Mapping the feculent bodily terrain was a highly scatological enterprise for these, to use Kelly Anspaugh's term, "shit artists" (Anspaugh 75), who manufactured the "shitty," "bowel-clinging" subjects of plague-infested London (Nashe *Wks II*: 66). To adapt T.S. Eliot, this was "a life measured out in dunghills," a life fashioned with a mess of turds and "a score of farts" (Nashe *Wks III*: 235). Manufactured through what Nashe called "the excrements of Artes" (Nashe *Wks I*: 20), the satirist dissected and refashioned a tortured soul trapped in an excremental body – "a bundle of Farts" (*CMC* IIII 47) – that mingled with the urban "flesh-manured earth" (Nashe *Wks II*: 63). In these ranting diatribes, satirists vivisected bodies "more base then basenesse it selfe, the verie shame of men, and the staine of manhood" (Rich G2), bona fide Marstonian "muckhill[s] ouer-spred with snow" (*SOV* 74). If nothing else, the misanthropic authors agreed that the citizens of early modern London could be real shits[28] – "wanshapen shit[s],"[29] in fact – sinners who could "spinne a webbe out of their owne bowels" when squeezed hard enough, as Thomas Adams suggested in *The divells blanket* [1613] (*DB* 75). Through the anatomy, however, these stercoraceous beasts would inevitably receive their deserved comeuppance.

---

[27] See William Bullein's *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence By William Bullein. From the Edition of 1578* [1888], 2; and Thomas Dekker's *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker Vol. 4*, 216.

While the satyrist did "muck ranke hate" (*SOV* 69) he besmeared a body dredged out of the "cole-blacke puddle: whose infections staine" (Hall *Coll Poems*: I II 13). For Joseph Hall and the satyr-anatomist, the debasement of the body was a central theme for writers commenting on the social and moral impact of plague. Through the satirical anatomy, writers often shamed the body by reducing it to a lump of excrement. Jonson's "Bobadilla," from *Every Man in His Humour* [1598], for example, reduced the target of his abuse to: "A whoreson filthy slave, a turd, an excrement" (*EMIH* II ii 111). When Donne wrote "Man is a lump, where all beasts kneaded be," he, like any satirist, was urbane enough to realise that the best way to shame and debase humanity was to reduce London's rational animals to the loathsomest of all base substances: filthy excrement (Donne *Maj Wks*: 200).

While the body was *The Purple Island* [1633] for Phineas Fletcher, the body remained for the Elizabethan and Jacobean satirist, a feculently brown isle. To use

---

[28] Martin Pops, for example, writes of "man as shit" in his essay "The Metamorphosis of Shit." *Salmagundi* (Spring 56, 1982) 55.

[29] In *Flyting w. Polwart* 85, Montgomerie speaks of the "Wanshapen shit." See *OED Vol. XV*, 286.

Tourneur's metaphor, the body's "transformed metamorphosis" embodied a distinctly excremental essence. In *The Transformed Metamorphosis* [1600], Tourneur expressed the satirical perspective regarding the "dungy" corporeal body. "The flesh, the soule's imprisoner," wrote Tourneur, "Of excrementale earth is wholy fact" (Tourneur *Wks*: 62). As Jonson's Sordido likened himself to "an vnsavorie Muck-hill" in *Every Man Out of His Humour* [1600] (*EMO* I ii 2408), the soul's cage was a mucky one indeed, seething in what Tourneur called "soule-infecting dong" (Tourneur *Wks*: 63). In a similar vein, William Rankins referred to the body an "ougly cell," an abject construct housing an equally abject soul (*SSA* 5).

For the London satirist, the city's unwelcome dunghills were not only symbolic of her urban filth, but also her inhabitants, for in much of the discourse of plague-time, humankind was anatomized and reduced to a revulsive and repellent object -- full of, quite literally -- shit. According to most satirical accounts, London was a dystopian capital inhabited by a dystopian population. The seemingly healthy grotesque satirical body was a phobic discursive construct scatologically fashioned as fearful and loathsome. This anatomised bodily frame of "half-dung bones" (*SO V* 32), projected abjection without and "horror within" (Kristeva 53). According to John Marston, "Each dunghill pesant" inevitably found himself under the invective scrutiny of the satirist (*SOV* 3). This scatological reductionism was not a seminal creation of the early modern era but entered the public realm during the medieval period with morality plays such as *Mankynde*.[30] As the character "Mankynde" expressed in horror: "Alas! What ill fortune and mischance / Made thee associate with my flesh, that stinking dunghill," the association between humankind and human waste has had a long and feculent history (*Mankynde* 17).[31]

---

[30] Although Eric Partridge has argued that 'shit' has been used as a term of contempt for humanity from the sixteenth century to the present, Partridge, however, seemed to have overlooked Chaucer's *Prologue* and the medieval morality play, *Mankynde* among other medieval scatologia. See Eric Partridge cited in Edward Sagarin's *The Anatomy of Dirty Words*, 52-53.

Re-establishing ordure as a metaphor for the human body, then, early modern satirists reinforced the abject status of the body scatologically. "The value of shit, tropologically speaking," according to Kelly Anspaugh, "lies precisely in its abject status and in its power for projecting abjection" (Anspaugh 97). As John Marston said in *The Scourge of Villainie* [1599], "the dungie muddy scum / Of abiect thoughts" (*SOV* 2) and what Rachel Speght called the "excrement of . . . roaring cogitations" infected the discourse of plague as the satirical disciplinarians condemned the ungodly excesses and abuses of early modern culture (Speght B2). In a Kristevan vein *avon la lettre*, John Lyly complained in *Pappe with an Hatchet* [1589]: "for if the Queenes Maiesties have such abiects for her best subiectes, let all true subiects be accompted abiects" (Lyly *Comp Wks III*: 411). For the medical writer Timothy Bright, the sinful Londoner was "the abiectest thing that [wa]s" (Bright 33). As Thomas Norton concluded: "Abject sillie men we be . . . yea and if you will, certaine excrements and outcasts of the world";[32] Londoners were a sight not to behold or smell because, according to Donne, they "Sit and embrace the [very] dunghills they have loath'd" (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 484).

Despite the scriptural allusions intimating the possibility of an excremental corporeality, even the empiricist propensities of Aristotle seemed to substantiate an excremental ontology with his ancient dictum: "all life arises out of dunghills."[33] "Nourished in corrupt dunghils," (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 8), much like the filthy turd mounds they were fashioned into by Lodge and others, the vivisected body more resembled "the sower cariage" of a gongfarmer than a human frame (*MOA* 85). In their "Odoriferous Breeches" (*CR* IV iii 1895), "base dunghill villain[s]" (*2H6* I iii 193), "dunghill grooms" (*1H6* I iii 14), "slimie dunghil slaue[s]" (Weever 1948: 67) and "Tom Tosspot[s]" (Campbell 83) frequented shitty places such as "Dunghill Lane," "Dunghill Stairs," and "Dung Wharf" (Harben 207). Upon the city streets, lanes and alleys, scatological archetypes, "The scumme of people, Watchman, Changling, Whore" (Randolph *Poems*: 17) indulged in "base channel rogarie" (*SOV* 35). As Donne informed the targets of his abuse, "Manure thyself then" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 52), the humanist "crown of creation" became little more than a populace of sinful "dunghills covered in snow." "Those earthy, Dull, Clay-pated fellows" that Shackerley Marmion fashioned in *The Soddered Citizen* [1623] (*TSC* II i 1041) were bodies that "delight[ed] in dunghill clay" according to Joseph Hall (Hall *Coll Poems*: 25). These were the bodies of urbanites Ben Jonson's lisping Gertrude of *Eastward Ho* [1604] called the"chity" of London and its "Chitizens," echoing "shit."[34] For the more scatological anatomists like Donne, Marston, Nashe, Harington and Jonson, this was a populace of Bottoms,[35] Bidets,[36] Laverdures,[37] Shattillions,[38] Philpots,[39]

---

[31] Reducing humanity to a lump of excrement still remains one of the most favoured contemptuous and debasing epithets in the postmodern lexicon, but this is a tradition we have inherited. From Chaucer to More, Jonson to Swift, and from Lawrence to Joyce, shaping the excremental body has had a prosperous history in English literary circles.
[32] See *OED Vol V*, 513.
[33] Aristotle cited in Lawrence Kubie's "The Fantasy of Dirt" *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* (No. 6, 1937), 405.

---

[34] This scatological insight was made by James T. Henke in his *Courtesans and Cuckolds: A Glossary of Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare)*, 40. See also Jonson's *Eastward Ho* (I ii 159, 162).

[35] In Shakespeare's *A Midsummer's Night Dream*, "Bottom" the lowly and rude mechanical's name associated him with the posterior. His epithet also foreshadowed his metamorphosis into an "ass."

[36] John Marston's play, *What You Will* contains a page named "Bidet" reducing the character to the basinlike bath for washing one's privates.

[37] Bidet's master in Marston's play, *What You Will*, is none other than "Laverdure," a compound noun fusing "laver" - French for "to clean" and the suffix "dure" from the scatological noun "ordure," resulting in an epithet suggesting "clean ordure."

[38] "Shattillion" is "a Lord, Mad for Love" in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Noble Gentleman* from *The Dramatic Works in Beaumont and Fletcher Canon Vol. 3* .

[39] The "Philpot" not only filled the chamber pot, but was full of shit. See James T. Henke's *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays Vol. 2, 229.*

Ass-trologers,[40] Madam Suppositories,[41] Marquesses of New-Ditch[42] and the Shore-ditch Duke.[43] To again adapt Butler's metaphor, these were "botties that mattered," "prating ass[es]" of "rotten mouldering clay" (Middleton *Wks VIII*: 118). If *The Devil [Wa]s an Ass* [1616], as Jonson's play suggested, many writers, especially Jonson, suggested that, so too were the bulk of Londoners.[44]

More often than not, however, these scatological constructions were not created in humor, but rather, in bitter condemnation, which was the case in Shakespeare's play *Sir Thomas More* [1595]. In this historical drama, the mutineering rebels of the "diseased" city are denounced as excremental by Lincoln, who bemoaned: "for theise basterds of dvng haue infected vs, and yt is our infeccion will make the Cytty shake" (*STM* VI 17-20). Of course the excremental body fashioned through satire was not commended by all. The satirists had their critics, as the Anglican clergyman Stephen Gosson warned in his attack on poets and actors: "lament their follie, and perceiue their sharpe sayings to be placed as Pearles in Dunghils, fresh pictures on rotten walls" (Gosson A3). But Gosson and his camp played a relatively minor role in the anatomy of plague, a more silent minority to the masters of shame and disgust. In this instance, however, Gosson turned the turd back upon the satirist, likely muddying himself in the process.

The scatological tradition which *Mankynde* exemplified would continue into the early modern period. Like their medieval counterparts, Londoners were equally "beshited"[45] because it was during the Renaissance that the turd became satirically personified. In Gabriel Harvey's *Foure Letters and Certaine Sonnets* [1592], for example, "Sir reuerence, A scuruy Master of Art, / Answeared inough with a Doctors fart" first appeared (Harvey 12). Everard Guilpin preferred the epithet: "goodman Tord" (Guilpin 65) while Samuel Rowlands used "dunghill swaines" (Rowlands *Wks II*: 43) to denounce misers for whom "Such malice worldly mucke doth breede in euery man alyue," as Gascoigne added (Gascoigne *Comp Wks III*: 559). The debasing constructions of Thomas Bastard's "filthy muckers" (*CSB* 172), were sustained beyond the Renaissance and well into the eighteenth century when a so-called "dirty filthy man or woman" continued to be referred to as "dung" or "moving dunghills" in Francis Grose's *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* [1785] (Grose I1). Moreover, early modern London was an excremental realm where "dunghills" were also "cowards" and "to die dunghill" meant to repent.[46] While Beaumont and Fletcher's character Jacques spoke of "Our dunghill breeding and our durt" (*OED* CD ROM) in *The Noble Gentleman*, it was apparent that even the nobility were not above reproach, according to L. Humphrey's historical work, *The Nobles* [1563]: "Nothing plagueth England but the many breaches and ever unsure never faithful friendship of the nobles."[47] Such were the satirical perils for "Men rich in dirt and titles" (*AF* I I 67-68).

---

[40] Nashe's "Adam Fouleweather" is referred to as a "Student in Asse-trologie" (Nashe *Wks III*: 381) in *A Wonderfull, strange and miraculous, Astrologicall Prognostication for the yeer of our Lord God. 1591.*

[41] In Jonson's *The Alchemist*, Epicure Mammon described Dol Common as "Madam Suppository," an excremental "whore" (ALC V v 13).

[42] Jonson's "Marquess of New-Ditch" appeared in his uncollected poetry in a work entitled "57. To Inigo Marquess Would Be A Corollary." See *The Complete Poetry of Ben Jonson*, 396.

[43] Again, Jonson's scatological character was deliberately named after a seedy London parish northeast of London. The hyphenated name "ditch" has obvious scatological connotations. See *A Tale of a Tub* [1633] (III vi 4-5).

[44] As Ben Jonson's junior devil Pug discovered during his day on earth, humanity could be even more devious than the spawn of Satan. Thus the subtext of Jonson's unsuccessful comedy intimated that the it was the Londoner and not the devil that was the most excrementally devious ass. See Jonson's *The Devil is an Ass.*

While plague affected all classes, the greatest victims of plague -- the poor -- were also London's most excremental inhabitants. Shakespeare echoed this cultural adage in *Coriolanus* where the poor remained "the common muck of the world" (*COR* II ii 126). Similarly for Sidney, "an ordinary person [was] (borne of the mud of the people),"[48] whereas bastards were called the "common issue of the earth" (Henke 1974: 102). The great unwashed were the smelliest and dirtiest urban inhabitants. It followed, therefore, that the foul-smelling poor were the most vulnerable to miasmatic plague. Perhaps Dekker best captured the disturbing mortality of the poor when he described streets where the poor were "knockt downe like Oxen, and fell thicker then Acornes" (*PPD* 33). The filth and squalor of the poorest houses disturbed not only London satirists, but foreign dignitaries such as Erasmus. During his visit to London, the Dutch humanist intimated that the poorest seemed to inhabit "privie" houses:

---

[45] As Mischief had warned Mankind in the medieval morality play *Mankynde*: "A plague go with you! I have foul luck here. / Get away from me or I'll beshit you all." See *Mankynde: A Morality Play Translated from Middle English*, 39.

[46] See Francis Grose's *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* [1785], Ii.

[47] L. Humphrey cited in Lawrence Stone's *The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641*, 98.

> The floors are made of clay, and covered with marsh rushes constantly piled on one another, so that the bottom layer remains sometimes for twenty years incubating spittle, vomit, and the urine of dogs and men, the dregs of beer, the remains of fish, and other nameless filth. (Classen, Howes & Synott 2)

J.C. Wylie reiterates, the "rush floored halls of Tudor England" were "no cleaner than the bottom of a paleolithic cave" (Wylie 27). The waste was removed and recycled periodically by saltpetre miners to manufacture gunpowder [49] or spread on fields for fertilizer, but the presence of filth remained an inherent danger explained the Parisian physician Angelus Sala in 1617:

> nothing in the world so drawes downe the plague as illnesse and stinke. . . For when plague comes into a land, it begins with poore and dirty folke who live

---

[48] Sidney's *Arcadia* is cited in *OED Vol. X*, 53.

[49] According to Wylie, once the floor sediments were at a "thickness of two or three feet it was removed to caves where it was mixed with urine, blood, and wood ash. After maturing for two years, the decayed matter was used to manufacture gunpowder" (Wylie 27). The industry reached a fevered pitch in 1601 during a parliamentary debate on the saltpetre industry. One member complained of saltpetre men digging "'in bedchambers, in sicke rooms . . . yea even in God's house, the Church'" (Ibid. 29).

> crammed all together like pigges in narrow styes and whose lives, pastimes and converse are like those of wilde beestes. (Le Guérer 31)

The filth of the poorer areas both bred and sustained epidemic disease and, thus, the impoverished remained targets of abuse for assumedly spreading plague.

Though the poor inhabited the more abject quarters of the city, inhabiting "shittier" houses or living along the filthy gutter, the wealthy got muddied by the satirist as well. Samuel Rowlands explained the levelling nature of excrement this way: "Kings are made of Clay; and so are wee" (*HBL* B3). Like death, shit was the grotesque social leveller in the "universe filled with shitters" that Elizabeth Charlotte would later emphasize (Dundes 64). Somewhat more vulgar but in the same spirited vein of Harington's *Metamorphosis of Ajax* [1596], Charlotte wrote:

> I can excuse porters, guards, sedan-chair carriers, people of that low caliber, but emperors shit, empresses shit, kings shit, queens shit, the pope shits, cardinals shit, princes shit, and archbishops and bishops shit, priests and vicars shit. You have to admit the world is full of disgusting people. (Ibid. 64)

Whether rich and poor, both were destined for the grave and both "shit shytters"[50] were frequently destined for the privy. As Montaigne said: "Perched on the loftiest throne in the world, we are still sitting on our own behind" (Shengold 73). Sitting, shitting, or standing -- bourgeois or plebeian -- all healthy bodies were inherently excremental.

The anatomy of the excremental body revealed a mostly solid waste state. A watered down version of the excremental body was, however, also anatomised by the more empirically inclined satyr who drew upon biblical ontology and a quasi-humoural body. This was an anatomised body that was terminally imbalanced. It was within this bodily domain that liquid met solid, "dust, and nastie mud" (*HH* 44) congealed and generated the unstable muck and mud of satirical corporeality or what Nashe called "the dregs and drosse of morality" (Nashe *Comp Wks II*: 41). Having surveyed the excremental exterior, the next stage in the anatomy of the uninfected body examines the excremental interior, the murky insides of this feculent vessel.

---

[50] In *Flyting w. Montgomerie* [1585], Polwart spoke of the "shit shytter." See *OED Vol. XV*, 286.

Muddy Fluids: The Bowels of Incompassion and Humoural Anarchy

Working through the metaphor of the anatomy, the satirical dissection of the uninfected body revealed an internal realm that was even more repugnant than its dungy surface. While Samuel Rowlands spoke of the "muddie humour" of the "satiric libeller" (Rowlands *Comp Wks II*: 10), many satyr-anatomists directed their abuses at the anarchic muddy waters of the excremental body, "the confluence of vicious corrupt and malignant humours" (Sanford 7) who "haue theyr life from putrid slime" (*SOV* 62). Though John Marston set out "to purge the snottery of [thei]r slimie time," like his satirical contemporaries, Marston most frequently purged the overmoist dung of this "slimie"corporeal body (*SOV* 21). The tactile vocabulary of abstract "dust and slime" (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 44) dominated the discourse of the anatomy, a largely biblical lexicon that fashioned an hybrid interior abjectness unparalleled in earlier satirical works. It was within the interior of this muddy body that the satirist took disgust to its threatening limits. "Besides blood, phlegm, bile (choler), and black bile (melancholy), the term humour," as Gail Kern Paster points out, "also referred to a numerous subset of bodily substances, for a humour generally was 'what thing so ever is Liquide and flowing in the body of living Creatures endued with Blood'" (Paster 69). Much like Marston's apish poet who "slinks away, leaving but reeching streames of dungy slime behind" (*SOV* 93), the anatomised body would yield a trail of foul matter and "defiling fluids"[51] in its hellish dissective wake.

When satirical anatomists like John Weever claimed to "Tear out the bowels of sins hidden long," they vivisected a body eclipsed by the dominance of dysenteric entrails and runny feculent "matter" (Gransden 138). These anatomists either ignored or simply shovelled aside the vital organs after making that "greate stroke ouer the bowels and belly" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks IV*: 181), "exposing," as Jonson added, the "rheums, raw humours, crudities, obstructions, with a thousand of this kind" (*EMI* III ii 76-78). Once opened, the anatomised body cavity most often resembled a swollen bowel without compassion, an aversive Rabelaisian construct[52] whose "quaffing Bowles" and "Ranke Guts" were composed of ordure and a suspicious confluence of other repellent matter which bore more resemblance to a demonic abyss than body matter (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks III*: 45 & 44). In *Via Recta* [1620] Tobias Venner spoke of bodies that "had in their flesh much moist excrementall juyce" (Venner 85). Venner intimated that coagulating inside the grotesque body was an aversive mélange of excremental quiddity -- dung, sweat, blood, tears, urine, saliva and humoral fluids -- that Dekker described as a "moist mystery" of ordure and anarchic humours (*GH* 13).

These were evacuating bodies which, apart from shitting, explained Nicholas Breton, did "cough, halke, spit, fart and piss" (Breton *Wks I*: 5). But what exactly was this confluence of corporeal dregs the satyr complained of? In his definitive

---

[51] See Julia Kristeva's *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, 3.

[52] In *Gargantua and Pantagruel* Rabelais's peasants perform a living and explicitly excremental anatomy on Pantagruel. Swallowing the tiny peasants like a "pill":

> Groping and sounding their way through the stench, these heroes approached the faecal matter and the corrupt humors, finally discovering a heap of ordure. The picks stuck valiantly to break it loose, the shovels did double duty filling the baskets. (Rabelais *Bk II* 288)

Although comic in intent, Rabelais resonates in the excremental body of early modern England in a more serious but equally graphic fashion.

Thesaurus [1565], Thomas Cooper defined "Excrementum," "the dregges or excrements of digestion made in the bodie as fleume, choler, melancholie, urine, sweat, snivell, spittle, milk, [and] ordure,"[53] suggesting a more watery than viscous consistency. But the often paradoxical satirical body was both digestive and digestor. It produced "excrementum" because the body was excrementum. Within the body, matter putrefied and decayed continually within the cycle of living death. Not to be outrivalled, John Donne added his own excessive complement to Cooper's "excrementum" in his grotesque and misogynist, "The Comparison." For Donne, the defiling fluids of

> Ranke sweaty froth thy Mistresse's brow defiles,
> Like spermatique issue of ripe menstrous boiles,
> Or like the skumme . . .
> From parboild shooes, and bootes, and all the rest...
> (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 150),

contained not only excrement and the humours, but the contaminating dregs of "sweat," "sperm," "menstrual issue," and the "skumme" generated by the feet. Donne's volatile disgust of the female body was made obvious here as were the contaminating fluids excreted by his subject's body. Such was the aversive state of the excremental female body, at least in Donne's scatological vision.

As viscous as the excremental interior was, however, it was still prone to incidents of disproportionate fluidity. Apart from the reigning presence of ordure then, the satirist, physician and wordsmith articulated the presence of humours which were, like the body, out of control and hyperbolically imbalanced. The physician Thomas Thayre, for example, expressed his concern over "those bodies wherein there is Cacochymia," "corrupt and superfluous humours abounding, [which] [we]re apt and lightly infected, those humours being themselues inclined and disposed unto putrifaction" (*ATP* B1). In plague time, it seemed, *Every Man* [was] *out of His Humour* [1599], as Jonson's title suggested. However, the anatomy was not some plotless comedy but a plotless tragedy where "bad corrupt humours [we]re as Trayters" (*ABT* 41): a treasonous body betrayed by the stagnant cesspool of its own "merd-urinous load" and steaming sins of its own desires (Jonson *Comp Poems*: 69).

---

[53] See *OED Vol. V*, 513.

As the anatomy unfolded, however, the seething humours of medical discourse played a minor role in this satirical profusion of muddy slime where "gowtie humours quake[d]" (R.C. 2). While Gail Kern Paster rightly argues that "Every subject grew up with a common understanding of his or her body as a semipermeable, irrigated container in which humours moved sluggishly," the satirists frequently rendered humoral fluids into "muddy waters" (Paster 8). Even for those satirists who were inclined to retain some semblance of the humoural body, the "sluggish humours" became little more than painful and morally charged incontinent flux "To grudge, chafe, pine & freat" over (*MOA* 80). Humoural imbalance was known as *Dykrasia* and conversely, balanced humours *Eukrasia*.[54] The imbalanced "dungy" body suffered from the volatile state of *Excrasia*,[55] a bodily condition that "Exhale[d] out filthy smoke and stinking streames" (Hall *Coll Poems*: I iii 14) in "breath's noysome as the ayre of the infectious dogg dayes" (*TSC* ii I 933-34).

This bodily anarchy[56] not only affected the body's control over the soul but its rule over its physical constitution as well. According to Edward Heron, "the whole fabricke of this little world our body is put out of frame by the rebellious humours, striuing to ouer-master one another" (Heron 40), to which, added Nashe, "all the light imperfect humours of our bodies ascend like mud vp aloft into the head" (Nashe *Wks I*: 357). The flood of mud and urinary water "rebelling" within the body envelope proved a lethal combination as Thomas Adams confessed: "Others haue been drowned with a deluge of waters in their owne bodies, a floud running betwixt their skin and bowels, glutting and ouercharging nature so violently, that the life hath not been able to hold vp her head" (*ES* 80). For "Those bodies that are moyst, and full of iuice" (*WMP* 46) wrote the physician Stephen Bradwell, the "bitter juices of horror" (Sidney *Poems*: 35) within the body not only permeated the flesh but mirrored the state of the soul; a soul drowning in the mire of extinction and damnation as in Psalms 69:2: "I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me." The excremental body was literally drowning in the muddy dregs of its own filth, argued Thomas Walkington in his anatomy *The Optick Glasse of Hvmors* [1607]. For Walkington, the body was "swimming as it were with the eddy and current of our base humours, wee do perish on the sea of voluptuosness, long before we come to our wished port" (*OGH* D8). "The mudde of our vncleane poole," added Henoch Clapham, was "stirred vp to the poysoning of all the blood and powers" (Clapham 1604: B2). Engulfed in the deluge of mucky volatility, the body runneth over with excrement and the humoral "slime that from our soules doe flow" (*SOV* 76), living a "dirtie life" and a "muddy death" (*HAM* IV vii 183). This corporeal hybrid of humours and deep murky waters symbolised bodies consumed in the mire of their own "bottomles" sin. Salvation, therefore, appeared all but unobtainable for the early modern body condemned by "the vulgar doome" of the satirist (*BRI* 155).

---

[54] See Robert Gottfried's *The Black Death: Natural and Human Disaster in Medieval Europe*, 106.
[55] This neologism is mine and is intended to convey the excrementory state of the humoural body.
[56] By the term "bodily anarchy" I mean the proverbial "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak"; the power the appetitive urges over the body, driving its propensity to sin.

For some satirical anatomists, the anatomised body resembled a "conduit" through which the ebb and flow of liquid matter impelled itself. Unlike contemporary medical discourse, however, humours were not life-giving liquids but defiling fluids "from the veines / Of Rottennes and Filth, that reigne[d]" (*PPD* 82). The humoral body became increasingly more execrable in the hands of the vivisecting satirist as Pierre Drout's *A new Counsell against the Pestilence* [1578] demonstrated. In this work, the morally charged nature of "suche bodyes . . . stuffed with euyll humours" were clearly laid out (Drout D2). William Bullein preferred to foreground the aversive nature of the body fluids where "the humours are grosse and baken together, or the runnyng matter farre in or skant ripe, and nothyng wil come forthe but Salte, sharpe, filthie, stinckyng water" (*DFP* 47). Similarly, Thomas Walkington thought fit to warn his readers that these dangerous fluids flowed throughout the "conduit of the body" in "a current of infectious humours, which doe flow ouer the veines, and ingrosse the limpid spirites in their arteries" (*OGH* C4). As Drout, Bullein and Walkington explained, diluted bodily flux was demonic, defiling and disgusting, but then, these muddy "puddle humours" (Ibid. H2) were what made body "disgust unavoidably misanthropic in its cast" in the first place (Miller *Anatomy*: 204).

Through the body's essential nature[57] and especially through sin, the "pure" water of life[58] had become a clouded and befouled puddle within the body. As Francis Meres explained: "There is a great difference betweene the standing puddle and the running streame, yet both water" (Meres 47). In a Meresian vein, Richard Greenham added his own moral adage, explaining that even "the most glorious actions of men [who have sinned] are but as waters flowing purely from the Conduit, but defiled by passing through a filthy chanell" (*AMS* E4). Using sewage analogies to force their points, satirical writers like Shakespeare reminded audiences that despite the appearance of purity, even "the purest spring [wa]s not so free from mud" (*2H6* III i 101), and, as Dekker added, "all the fountains in the world could not wash our spots" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks V*: 66) for bodies "overflowing with the corrupt humours of this age's fantasticness" (*GH* 21-22).

---

[57] By essential nature, I mean the natural functions of the body, the defecation of body effluvia.
[58] See Psalms 36:9: "with you is the fountain of life"; and Psalms 87:7: "all my springs are in you."

The dual nature of bodily fluids gave these aversive liquids an ambiguous status as both cause of and possible cure for disease and mortality. In ***London looke backe*** [1630], for example, an optimistic Dekker offered one way out of the muddy deluge of the body. According to Dekker:

> For as wee sincke to the Bottome of the watters, as the Carpenters Axe did: But, though neuer so Iron-hearted, the voyce of *Elisha*, (the feruency of prayer and praysing God) can fetch vs from the bottome of Hell: And by contrition make vs swimme on the toppe of the waters of Life. (*PPD* 193)

Through a daily regime of prayer and repentance, Dekker's salvational method maintained that "waters of Life" might possibly preserve Londoners, not consume them. In any case, the muddy water remained a perennial threat to the body because of its sheer excess and the body's inability to sufficiently drain and channel the liquid refuse safely beyond its corporeal boundaries.

Much like the excremental landscape of the macrocosm, the Neoplatonic mapping of the body's interior revealed its own filthy system of kennels, ditches, dunghills, and foul puddles. Many satirists fabricated and dissected a bodily interior that resembled a microcosmic cloaca, a bodily construction that would inspire John Moore to ask: "What channell is so filthy?" (Moore 43). Satirists who considered the city landscape aesthetically and noisomely offensive extended their vision by deforming and reducing the interior body landscape to a grossly insanitary urban sewage system "With," as Sir Arthur Gorges suggested, its own "flancks and ditches deep" (Gorges 99). As George Chapman wrote in *The Tragedy of Charles Duke of*

Byron:

> I know this body but a sink of folly,
> The ground-work and rais'd frame of woe and frailty,
> The bond and bundle of corruption . . . (Enright 33)

the foulness of the body interior was very much a moral construction with an urban schemata; an inefficient and overflowing human sink.

The overmoist body with its muddy humours and excess of putrid slime proved a popular construction for the anatomy. Many satyr-anatomists, however, were more dismissive of the runny matter of the humoural body, preferring instead, to dissect a less "scyentific" and a more solid body excrementum. From the impurities of liquid waste, therefore, we shift our attentions to the slightly more solid waste matter of the excremental body – mud – the lowly dregs of earthly matter.

Viscous Mud: A Mucky Corporeality

Within the anatomy, the satyr-anatomist claimed to be exposing London's "varietie of filthie faces" that had even muddier bottoms and bowels to match (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 16). When Daniel Defoe complained in an Augustan context that "the Englishman was the mud of all races,"[59] he used a misanthropic tone that was largely inherited from Renaissance satirists who also commented on a "volatile" body. Like the body Shakespeare anatomised in *The Winter's Tale*, the dramatist explored a corporeality "so muddied, so unsettled," and so revolting (*WT* I ii 325).

As John Donne complained in "The Lamentations of Jeremy," "my bowels muddy bee" (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 477), the body was rife with what Sidney referred to in the "1st Eclogues" as its "such muddy abundance" (Sidney *Poems*: 34). While the evacuating natural body was a concern of the physician and anatomist, it was the "muddy" symbolic body satirists were most occupied and disgusted with. In a series of unsettling depictions, the anatomised body was reduced to little more than rank matter. "Made as the filth of the World," the body generated and submerged itself in its own fetid waste (*LHM* 3). As Dekker said in his anatomy from *The Gull's Hornbook* [1609]: "hide not drop of thy moist mystery from me, thou plumpest swill-bowl," these rather voyeuristic grotesqueries disgraced humanity by likening it to an overfull close-stool (*GH* 12-13). Like Jonson's drunks rowing across the fleet ditch in "On the Famous Voyage," grotesque satirists stirred the Stygian depths of the body envelope, exposing the macabre sights, the flatulent sounds and the noisome smells of a foul cavity teeming in its own "Ycleped mud" (Jonson *Comp Poems* 69). Within the satirical anatomy, however, these intestinal gropings were not disembowelling some comic interior, but rather, as Bullein's Medicus argued, "a filthie pit of darkenesse" (*DFP* 50) – a hellish abyss of "ample flakes" -- an unstable body (Jonson *Comp Poems*: 72).

---

[59] See *OED Vol. X*, 53.

The muddy body interior regularly exemplified the domain of the devil, a demonic refuge where "Satan," according to Thomas Adams was "so farre said to be gone out as he lyes hidden, like mudde and slime vnder a thicke snow" (*DB* 19). Among the muck and mud of the body, the uninfected body also had to contend with the presence of the horned one. "This weake temple of [th]y body" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks V*: 18) apparently provided a profane refuge for "the great Parasite of the soule": the devil (*DB* 74). Thus, "These excrements of th'earth, the heauens refuse, / Of mankinde Monsters," wrote Sir William Alexander, remained "Natures utter staine," a corrupting and polluting force to be reckoned with (Alexander *Poe*

Wks II: 149). This grotesque obsession with the dungy interior, the "mudde-billows" (*SSA* 23) of the body; the "dust, and nastie mud" (*HH* 44) or "the liquid flood / Of muddy fell defiance" redefined the body interior for the satirist (Middleton *Wks VIII*: 116). Predominantly moral and metaphorical, this metaphysical "filth and mudde of the basenesse, shame, and corruption of Man" (Rous 1622: 266) that Francis Rous denounced, both dominated and contaminated the body as its "scabby festers inwardly unsound" (Hall *Coll Poems*: II iii 26) oozed feculent emissions from "loynes . . . filled with filthy and abominable corruption" (Sanford 6).

Fashioning a "muddy inside" (*SOV* 16) teeming in "merds, and clay," the classical body exterior was subverted by a detestable interior: reigning shit (*ALC* II iii 195). As they "striked below the girdle" (*MOA* 79) and pared away at their symbolic cadavers, the satirical knives regularly exposed a, "Dirt-rotten" (*T&C* V i 23) body interior composed of nothing less than slimy ordure,[60] a grotesque construction "whereby ariseth great varietie of humours and excrements in our bodies" (Bright 16). For satirist and often physician alike, the tactile slime of the fermenting and putrefying muddy body and its "Merdurinous Mucke" were fashioned through surfeit and disgust (Taylor *Wks II*: 36). While William Miller refers to postmodern bodily slime as "life soup," for the early moderns, this bodily slime was unquestionably "shit soup" (Miller *Anatomy*: 40-41). Like Jonson's filthy privies, the body "walls d[id] [also] sweat Urine, and plaisters" in its own darkly grotesque fashion (Jonson *Comp Poems* 73).

Much like the second-century Christian Marcion of Sinope, who held a dim ascetic view of the body that he characterised as "full of excrement"[61] -- "a tradition that treated the entire inside as a mass of gooey, oozy, slimy, smelly things" (Miller *Anatomy*: 58) -- Donne also likened the slimy contents of the body to "excremental jelly." Donne explained in "A Sermon Preached at Lincoln's Inn" [1626?] that "Between that excremental jelly that thy body is made of at first, and that jelly which thy body dissolves to at last; there is not so noisome, so putrid a thing in nature" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 293). Like a dysenteric body teeming in "squtter"[62] and "swine's marmolet,"[63] Donne's lubricious conception fashioned a body in flux and a body of "flux" [diarrhoea], the most "putrid" construct imaginable (Henke 1979: 98).

---

[60] In an uncharacteristically weak moment, John Marston, in a slightly less misanthropic mode, referred to the body in *The Scourge of Villainie* [1599] as only "Half-dung." Despite his sardonic flattery, Marston likened Londoners to "Nilus Rats" amongst other foul and dirty imaginings. See Marston's *The Scourge of Villainie* [1599], 62.

In anatomising humanity, then, satirists were essentially anatomising "slimy" excrement. Their focus on the excremental constitution was not an entirely unique perspective, however, since ordure figured prominently in not only satire but in the medical literature of the Renaissance. The first book Gutenberg published after the Bible, in fact, was the *Laxier Kalender* [1457]; a purgation calendar suggesting the ideal time for laxatives.[64] Intestinal regularity was an important regime of daily living in the Renaissance. But where the priority of shitting was, at least in Gutenberg's mind, next to godliness, shitting, for Martin Luther[65] and the English satirists was a more profane act that edged closer to the apocalyptic and the demoniacal, just as it did for the medieval "monk whose lethal dysentery c[a]me as punishment for unconfessed sin."[66]

---

[61] See Michael A. Williams' "Divine Image - Prison of Flesh: Perceptions of the Body in Ancient Gnosticism in Jonathan Crary's et. al. *Fragments for a History of the Human Body Part One*, 143.
[62] In the mid-seventeenth century diarrhea was commonly referred to as "squtter." See See James T. Henke's *Gutter Life and Language in the Early 'Street' Literature of England*, 240.
[63] A euphemism for "human excrement especially from loose bowels, eaten by swine" (Ibid. 256).
[64] See Alan Dundes's *Life is Like a Chicken Coop Ladder: A Portrait of German Culture Through Folklore*, 118-19.
[65] As Norman O. Brown noted Luther constructed a "grossly concrete image of the Devil that made the privy the appropriate scene for his religious experience." See Brown's *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*, 209.

Having shared his "privy" vision with his reluctant audience, the satirical writer deconstructed London's macrocosmic "crap factories" in grotesque detail. Just as Sir John Harington used the privy for moralising, the satirist fashioned human "A-Jaxes" to help draw the comparison between dung and sin.[67] Exposing the "privy faults" of his subject, the satirist attempted to shame and humiliate a body fettered by "the call of human nature"[68] and the beckoning of sin. In Philip Stubbes's *The Anatomie of Abuses* [1583], Stubbes transformed the body into a quasi-compost/sewer where waste "lye stincking in their stomacks, as dirte in a filthie sinck or pryuie" "stincking, smelling, and rotting like filthie carion in a lothsom sinck" (*AA* I1 & I7). Apart from "eating filth" (*SOV* 73), then, the "shitten sort" of Londoners produced a wealth of filth as any prosperous jakes-farmer could have confirmed (Jonson *Comp Poems*: 70). Stubbes' bodily debasement was typical of the excremental vision of the interior anatomy where excremental matter reproduced itself and where Dekker would add, the dreaded "Worme of Conscience . . . lay gnawing / Both night and day" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks* III: 52).

As Stubbes, and Marston's anatomies attested, satirists manufactured a dank "anal" and self-befouling body that was intended to offend their readership. Where Shakespeare intimated in *The Second Part of King Henry the Sixth*, whether good or evil, pious or sinful, the soul found itself encased in corporeal mud and mucky slime (*2H6* III i 101). Shakespeare reaffirmed this construction in *The Merchant of Venice*, where Lorenzo reduced the body to "this muddy vesture of decay" (*MV* V I. 91). Although

---

[66] William Miller cites Guibert of Nogen (c. 1085) as the recorder of this scatological anecdote. See Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust*, 152.

[67] See D.H. Craig's *Sir John Harington*, 19 & 76.

[68] This evacuatory phrase is taken from Deiter and Jacqueline Rollfinke's *The Call of Human Nature: The Role of Scatology in Modern German Literature*.

Donne bemoaned in "The Litanie III," that despite being a "temple" of the "Holy Ghost," humanity remained composed of "mudde walls and condensed dust" (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 457). As Joseph Hall agreed, the "dungy drudge" of the body interior more resembled a filthy "sinke" than a living organism (Hall *Coll Poems*: I vii 18). Where the macrocosmic body had its primitive sewage system, the microcosmic body was muddy sewage incarnate; it not only evacuated but generated and regenerated feculent waste. This was a cloacal interior landscape; a miry rectal body controlled by "a logger-headed Asse" that, added Nicholas Breton, "hath no more wit than an old ioynd-stoole" (Breton *Wks* I: 6).

Of all the invective rants both exploring and subsequently denouncing the muddy body, few reached the misanthropic and excremental depths of "Malevole" in Marston's *The Malcontent* [1604]. In this Jacobean play, Malevole dissected the body this way:

> . . . the earth is the only grave and Golgotha
> wherein all things that live must rot; 'tis but the draught
> wherein the heavenly bodies discharge their corruption;
> the very muck hill on which the sublunary orbs cast their excrements.
> Man is the slime of this dung pit. (*MAL* IV v 106-11)

Confined within a "dung pit" universe, the slimey-interiored human reproduced that which he or she took in: shit. As Marston argued, the body generated filth from "eating filth" (*SOV* 73).

The satirical anatomist constructed a diarrhetic tide of excrementum surging under the filthy skin of the body which "gaue the suspicion of the dysentery" (Cotta D2). Within this dysenteric interior of "humid flux" [diarrhoea] (Henke 1974: 185), the putrefying mud of the satirical body was considered especially contaminating, prompting Marston to warn, "let not such mud as this / Pollute us still" (*SOV* 94).

Putrefying in their own slimy and sinful mire, the "mucky" body was the ideal medium for disease and disgust as the body sludged towards Jerusalem to be born. As Donne and the more metaphysical leaning anatomists would elucidate, the body's mucky corporeality could ultimately be dissected back to its dusty origins defined and debased in scriptural anecdotes.

Creatio Ex Stercore: Donne and the 'Vessels of Dung'

For those satirists dissatisfied with the mucky or muddy body, the more ambitious visionary anatomists of early modern London alternatively vivisected the excremental body right down to its atomic structure: dust. According to John Donne's anatomy in "Satyre V," owing to "The excrements which they voyd . . . all men are dust" (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 241). In this work, Donne poetically foregrounded the excremental essence of humanity within Christian ideology . This fascination with the dirty metaphorical body was not Donne's domain alone, but a preoccupation that captured the imaginations of many early modern English writers. Using scriptural typologies of the body as their starting point, satirical writers manufactured and embellished humanity's excremental ontology. To denounce human folly, satirists embellished the foulest typologies they could locate in order to trace the origin of the faeces back to its "dusty" prelapsarian roots. Making the quantum leap from dirt to dung was a short stumble for the satirist, as John Skelton would argue in 1495 because, "Man [wa]s but duste, stercorye and fylthe."[69]

But what exactly was this noisome "Base excrement of earth" that Donne described in his elegy "The Perfume" (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 144)? Like many of his contemporaries, Donne drew upon scriptural hermeneutics to fashion his own excremental anatomy of the body. Two of the most popular and "dirty" bodily constructions were lifted directly from the creation story in Genesis 2:7, where "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth" and the explanation of death in Genesis 3:19: "for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." But dissatisfied with the base and "dirty" origins of humanity, the early modern satirist further muddied the metaphorical composition of London, grotesquely distorting humanity by concentrating on the body's excremental component. This "hyperbolical" dusty composition served to augment humanity's baseness while it reasserted the body's impending mortality. Donne explained how divine dust mutated into filthy dirt this way: "The seat of our souls . . . / Made dirt of dust" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 242). The body was fashioned from the common muck of the earth, to which it would return as Donne explained in a sermon:

---

[69] See *OED Vol. XVI.*

> When I have so exhausted, so evacuated my self, that is, all confidence in my self, that I come into the hands of my God, as pliably, as ductily, as that first clod of earth, of which he made me in Adam, was in his hands, in which clod of earth, there was no kinde of reluctation against Gods purpose. (Donne *Sel Prose*: 367)

To Donne's credit, he did limit his scatological fabrication to human excrement. An earlier anonymous poem of the sixteenth century fashioned a Scotsman from a horse turd. Entitled "How the First Hielandman of God was made of ane Horse Turd in Argyll," the adamic Scotsman seemed to anticipate the excremental Englishmen yet to come. But where Donne invoked Saint Bernard to substantiate his muddy-walled man, the anonymous poet exhumes Saint Peter:

> Sanct Peter said to God

> In a sport word,
> Can ye not mak a Hieland man
> Of this horse turd. (Grigson 13)

With respect to human excrement, therefore, Donne, like his satirical contemporaries, was more of a purist than his forbears.

Of particular interest to this study is the condemned Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World* [1614] which attempted to transform biblical history into an empirical history. As John Speed included biblical genealogies in *The History of Great Britain* [1611], Raleigh also traced the body back to its biblical origins. Composed during his final imprisonment in the tower and unfinished at his death, Raleigh's historical anatomy of the world began with creation and went as far as the second century B.C. Raleigh's composition is noteworthy because of his scriptural vision of the excremental body in a Jacobean context. In "Section V," for example, Raleigh spoke of a body composed of the dust of "red earth, or, *ex limo terrae*, out of the "slime of the earth," or a mixed matter of earth and water" (Raleigh *Wks I*: 54). Like the satirist, Raleigh thought fit to foreground "slime" in the development of human composition.

By fashioning bodies into what John Godskall described in *The kings medicine* [1604] as "deformed Christians," the anatomised dusty and dirty flesh was sheathed in corruption (*TKM* L4). To reinforce the corrupt nature of the flesh, Genesis 6:12 was a particular favourite of William Warde, who appropriated this passage in *Gods Arrowes* [1607]: "God looked vpon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupt his way vpon the earth" (Warde D5). This emphasis on "corruption" served to remind the god-fearing populace of "the temporary nature of the present world and its subjection to decay and death" (Williams 104). The satirical anatomy would consistently argue, a corrupt vessel made for an unpleasant dissection.

Marston's fantastical scourge, *The Scourge of Villainie* had pointed out, the "smoaky house of mortall clay" was fashioned by God alone (*SOV* 90). As Psalms put it – "God remembered they were but flesh" (Psalms 78:39) but "he knows we are dust" (Psalms 103:14) – writers dissected the "wretched Worldlings made of dust and earth" as Aemilia Lanyer did in *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* (Lanyer 80). Similarly, Sir Philip Sidney hinted in the "Psalms of David" that this was the body "Of earthly man, a lord of dust" (Sidney *Poems*: 293). From its dusty origins, the body "Cast in the clay ground" (1Kgs. 7:46; 2 Chr. 4:17) soon metamorphosed into a "clod of earth" (Donne *Sel Prose*: 367), however. The sacred body was made more profane as the satirist drew scatological connections between dirt and dust. Anatomising "this tattered garment of our flesh," the satirist revealed a "rotten carcasse and clod of clay" (Man A7). In "The parable of potter and clay" from Jeremiah, for example, God resembled a potter in to which humans were "as the clay in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand" (Jer. 18:6). Donne affirmed this parable in his *Devotions*, saying, "the Lords hand was the wheele, upon which this vessel of clay was framed" (Donne *Sel Prose*: 92).[70] In the satirical anatomy, however, the "dusty" clay could also disgust, as it did in Marston's *The Second Return*, where a character was urged to make clay through urinating, by "lift[ing] his legge against his sacred dust."[71]

Just as the works Donne and his contemporaries asserted, biblical typologies set the earthy groundwork for the excremental body of the satirical anatomy. Wickedness and earthly detritus were synonymous for the angry satirist. By tendering an excremental ontology largely grounded on scriptural hermeneutics, the satirist reinvoked "the morbid hatred of the flesh," not evolving, but devolving the status of flesh into the past, similar to its abject rank within "the ascetic traditions of the early and high Middle Ages" (Miller *Anatomy*: 28). In a series of anatomical fantasies, the body was debased through the invective scrutinies of the early modern satirist. This was a satirical enterprise aimed at disciplining a shameful body through the discourse of disgust. The results were predictably unpleasant: human dissection under the satirical knife more resembled a stool analysis rather than a bodily anatomy. Again, this symbolic anatomy was not a Renaissance invention, but can be traced as far back as the twelfth century.[72]

---

[70] The metaphor of the "vessel" was a proper one especially for the so-called "weaker vessel" – women – appropriated from 2 Corinthians, where humans were represented as "earthenware vessels" (2 Cor. 4:7).

[71] See *OED Vol. V*.

As in Medieval times when visionaries like St. Hildegarde of Bingen "believed that God did not abide in healthy bodies" (Dubos 143), most early modern satirical visionaries put forth a similar premise based on biblical rhetoric and "malignant" imaginations. The satirical disgust and revulsion of the corrupt "healthy" body, whose anatomical structure more resembled an excrementally God-less and oftentimes filthy satanic microcosm was both a "disturbed Body" (A.H. 1625: 65) and "an ignorant body" (Chytraeus C4). If nothing else, satirical anatomies re-emphasised the grotesque configuration of common clay and earthly detritus by foregrounding the body's inherent uncleanness.

Similar to Donne 's excremental vessel, Robert Underwood likened the body to a Lutherean sack of shit in *A New Anatomie* [1605]. In this symbolic anatomy, Underwood complained of humanity's deceiving façade:

> Mans Body for to be a Sacke,
> or Budgetfull of Dust,
> All painted ouer cunningly
> with cullours white and redd,

---

[72] See Shulamith Shahar's "The Old Body in Medieval Culture" in *Framing Medieval Bodiesx*, 160.

And with a kind of slender Haire,
bethatched ouer head. (Underwood 40)

Earlier in the sixteenth century, the poet and satirist John Skelton paraphrased "Sainct Bernard" who, "Seyth a man is but a sack of stercorry, And shall return vnto wormes mete," emphasising humanity's dung-like or "stercoraceous" state and its guano-esque qualities.[73] Donne also paraphrased "good Saint Bernard" in his sermon literature. According to Donne's scheme -- "If it be a vessel of gold, it is but a vessel of excrements, if it be a bed or curious plants, it is but a bed of dung . . . *Erubescat vas stercorum*, let that vessel of uncleanness, that barrel of dung, confess a necessity of washing" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 280). The human body, as the satirical anatomist conveyed, possessed an inherent filth that could not be washed off, a filth that transcended flesh and permeated the soul itself.

As outlined in this chapter, the discursively anatomised flesh of the healthy body was both vile and intrinsically excremental. With its muddy interior and excremental exterior, the uninfected body was, as Donne's anatomy argued, a "vessel of dung." Within the excremental morphology of the anatomy, the satirist excoriated the turdish essence or stercorrean identity of the body. By reinforcing the body's abject status ontologically, the anatomised body proved fertile ground for corruption and disease. While distorting the borders between human tissue and human waste in this physiology of filth, the satirical writer cast aspersions and volatile disgust for his repellent scatological construct -- the healthy body -- besmearing and debasing the body in the process.

From the feculent terrain of the uninfected body, then, we shift our focus to the altered state of the *dis-eased* body. Although excrement was part of the body's contaminating material structure, it was pestilence, not ordure, that remained the greatest "Enemy to mans health" (*LPA* 34), as the anatomy of infection explained and bodily disgust intensified. If asked to give a generalized characterization of what follows I would suggest that while Chapter Three concentrates on the anatomy of the infected body and its discharges, Chapter Four focusses on the smell of London and its plague victims.

---

[73] See *OED Vol. XVI.*

Chapter Three
The Infected Body I

Anatomising Infected 'Bodies That Didn't Matter'

The anatomy of uninfected bodies was, as both legitimate and satirical anatomist concurred, a highly aversive venture. Though the infected plague body was often at the frontiers of "scyentific" and religious debate throughout the early modern period, none dared physically dissect it. The subterranean depths of plaguy flesh remained the domain not of surgeons or comparative anatomists, but of an imagined realm created by the discursive musings of satirical anatomists. While the anatomists and physicians did not understand the exact cause or transmission of plague, the anatomist knew well enough that he might likely perish by dissecting "the disturbed Body" of infection (A.H. 65). The connection the medical establishment made between the treatment of disease and infection was a paranoid but a logical one. As the author of *The Description of the late great, memorable and prodigious Plague 1625* put it:

> How many fierce and bold diseases flow
> Vpon this wretched Carkasse, when each yeare
> New troupes of raging Feuers domineere. (A.H. 57)

Out of fear and common sense, London physicians only mapped (and quite phobically at that), the threatening exterior of the infected body. Its "many little pustules with elleuation of the skinne" (*ADP* 39) and its "rotten flesh," made the plague body intimidating to say the least (*AMS* D3). The exterior "eruption of these pestilential Blossoms" led many to infer that the interior was especially dangerous terrain (*LPA* 47). Most, if not all, physicians and anatomists recognized the possible infectious dangers of such an interior venture, and avoided it accordingly.

The purpose of this chapter is to untangle the sinuous web of deceit the Renaissance satirist manufactured in his anatomical ventures into the infectious scapegoat known as the plague body. Anatomising satirists went to excessive and invective lengths to carve up the defiling force of the infected body, a figurative construct that embodied all that was evil during the epidemical junctures of the early modern city. Claiming he had exposed the deforming force of plague, the satirist professed to have an intimate knowledge of the inner most workings of plague on both the surface and deep within the body. In his elucidations the satirist mapped a repugnant "anatomy wherein those blemishes and abuses may be perfectly seene" (Abusivia A1).

To the physicians' credit, there were good reasons for refraining from such a precarious "scyentific" inquiry. Since the empirical cause some sought for plague remained in the penumbra of doubt, their phobic suspicions were, therefore, warranted. The early modern doctors and barber-surgeons who did cut into infected "living" bodies, only lanced buboes, phlebotomised or cauterized patients in an attempt to cure the illness, induce suppuration, or at least, alleviate some of the accompanying pain. These were topical incisions, however, not interior or exploratory surgeries. While many medical writers recorded their observations of sores, ulcers and abscesses, the envelope of the infected body remained, understandably so, an intimidating mystery. Despite all the conjecturings, most recognized the infection's contagious nature,[1] while insisting that the Lord worked through nature in order to exact his justified vengeance upon an unregenerate city.[2] Working within this "premature teleology," then, the satirical writer focused primarily upon the moral causes of plague, not the "natural" causes (Frye *Anatomy*: 17).

---

[1] See Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 19.

[2] As Keith Thomas explains, "Most of those who saw plague as the product of divine wrath assumed that God worked through natural causes, bringing the epidemic by contagion or by the putrefaction of the air, according to which ever theory they favoured." See Thomas' *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, 86.

Unwilling to cut into the infected body, like their medical counterparts, satirical writers symbolically anatomised the non-corporeal plague body, fabricating textual bodies which morally degraded both the individual and the culture which fostered plague. Indeed, it wasn't until the Great Plague of 1665 – some forty years past the scope of this study – that an English anatomist "officially" dissected a body infected with plague. Through the rather bold efforts of George Thomson M.D., this legitimate anatomist distinguished himself in medical history when he published his anatomical findings in *Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized* in 1666. Up until that time (and including the period of this study), the inner bodily ravages of plague were more imagined than empiricised – the infected body remained part of the controversy of "obscure things" that William Harvey spoke of in his *Anatomical Lectures* [1616] (*ALH* 409). Preying on the obscurity and paranoia of the infected body, god-fearing satirists, hell-bent on changing the moral landscape of Renaissance London, misshaped the dissections of its citizens via the satirical anatomy.

Considering the marked propensity for avoiding contact with the infected, one can better appreciate the pronounced apprehension for dissecting a body cut down by plague. As early modern London's most phobic human construct and didactic signifier, the abject and contaminating force of the plague body was a perennial reminder of sin and confirmation of God's retributive displeasure.

This chapter's discussion of the infected body begins by first unveiling the root of infection, the "foul stigmatic" or abject sins of the body. Sin was not only the wages of death but the way of infection. In the following section the diseased body's threatening cultural status as plague's infectious scapegoat is delineated. By placing blame upon the sufferer, the satirist could rationalise the retributive nature of disease while justifying his misanthropical stance. Moving solely beyond the rhetoric of blame, the subsequent section considers the anatomical range of grotesque textures that are explored in what this study defines as the taxonomy of sores for bodies "lying in the hell mouth of infection" (Nashe *Wks III*: 87). This detailed cataloguing of sores will explain why pestilential eruptions were considered divine "wounds." The closing section concerns the infected body's contaminating array of volatile and suppurating emissions. This section will delineate the hyperbolical fears of the infected body's polluting and contaminating properties as generated by the anatomy. To understand the anatomy of infection, one must first understand the source of plague: abject sin.

The 'Foul Stigmatic': Dissecting Abject Sin

While the satyr-anatomist discursively carved his infectious enemies into unrecognizable pieces with quill in hand, James Godskall, in *The Arke of Noah* [1604] used sin as his scalpel. According to Godskall, "our sins, are as a razor," the satirist also used sin as a dissective instrument to anatomise and censure the infected body (*AON* A2). Anatomising the plague, as Godskall implied, was, however, as much about anatomising sin. By understanding the lethal impact of sin on Renaissance culture, one could rationalize the impact of plague on the body, because sin and infection were synonymous.[3] "Sinne gathers strength by custome," wrote Thomas Adams in *The divells blanket* [1613], "and creepes like some contagious disease in the body from ioynt to ioynt; and because not timely spied and medicined, it threatens vniuerall hazard to the whole" (*DB* 168-9). Having established sin as the primary vector of infection in the anatomy, it is no surprise that Sampson Price told his readers: "Let vs aboue all sores, flee the plague of sinne" (Price 39). Robert Wright similarly cautioned, "The relaps of sicknesse is dangerous, but the relaps of sinne is more dangerous," by forestalling sin and applying "spiritual physicke," the satyr-anatomist argued London could effectively eliminate pestilence (Wright 7).

---

[3] In *Sermons, Meditations, and Prayers, upon the Plague* [1636], Thomas Swadling described the deluge of the plague in a Jonahesque fashion. As Swadling said, "the Plague, Oh, that was evermore the spawne of some Whale-like sinne" (Swadling 10).

In *Gods Arrowes, or Two Sermons, concerning the visitation of God by the Pestilence* [1607], William Warde explained London's predicament this way: "sinne doth not onely bring Gods iudgements in generall, but also more particularlie, it is the cause of plague, pestilence, sickenesses and bodilie diseases" (Warde D6). The author of *Salomons Pest-Hovse* [1630] also described London's predicament in a similar fashion: "In vs the plague of sin: round about vs, the fire of the present plague: against vs, Sathan who seketh to make vs curse the Lord, and the fire of Gods wrath and anger" (J.D. 12). In William Perkins' estimation, London was a city "full of naughtines," with "lewd people tak[ing] pleasure in dooing wrong," and was, therefore, deserving of divine punishment (*ATT* 106). Clearly, most believed that the Lord's wrath had been unleashed upon London because, as Thomas Brewer vehemently maintained, "Punishment [wa]s the Companion of Sinne" (*LHM* A2). Like Brewer, the anonymous author of *The Description of the late great, memorable and prodigious Plague 1625* also emphasized divine retribution: "Thy dreadfull vengeance, which doth now display / Horror through all thy People, and begins / To shew the vgly portraict of our sins" (A.H. 60). The satirical literature of the anatomy argued that it was both the Lord's divine purpose and the satirist's moral obligation to expose the filthy sins of London in all their grotesque splendour.

With sin at the centre of the anatomy's dissective focus, the satirist was ultimately concerned with "the maladies and diseases that peruert and contaminate the soule;" more preoccupied with the metaphysical infection which was "farre more dangerous and mortall then those of the body" (Anatomy 1603: C7). For most satyr-anatomists, the spiritual body was more important than the corporeal body, a crucial distinction raised by Thomas Adams in *Englands Sicknes* [1615] where Adams explained, "The Spirituall detriment that may ensue on health, is more dangerous then the bodily paine that pursues sicknes" (*ES* 89). As he anatomised the infectious sins and infected sinners of urban London, however, the satirical response to these "pestilenced bodyes" (Clapham 1604: 14), was one of reproach and indictment for the diseased flesh and bones "deformedly torne in peeces" (Nashe *Wks II*: 31).

While general physical health was regularly praised because it was equated with piety, moral illness was frequently equated with, and blamed for, physical illness and deformity. According to the satirical anatomy, it was sin that pitted and erupted the body with carbuncles, tumors and buboes. By capturing the graphic anatomical details of their erupting discharges, the sights, the sounds, and yes, even the "ayre pestilenzing stincks" (Nashe *Wks II*: 142) of contagion, the satirists reduced infected bodies to "Blameworthy things" (*BRII* 468): suppurating objects of fear and abject subjects of scorn. As Acts 24:5 put it – "We have found this man to be a pestilence" – satirical writers reinforced a variety of misanthropic notions of humanity as sinful and dangerously infectious. In its own biblical vein the anatomy argued that London was an epidemical milieu where "sin doth infect" all those who came in contact with her moral viruses (Gascoigne *Comp Wks III*: 315).

Through their dissective homilies, satirists argued that by exposing the source of infection – sin – London could better react to the foreboding mortality and ultimately forestall infection completely through a pious plan of attack.[4] Despite its often graphic subject matter and discursive method, satirical vivisection was a spiritual anatomy often functioning under the guise of physical anatomy. In the anatomy, the infected body was more "*sparmagos,*" a symbolic, sacrificial body torn apart by the vindictive satyr-anatomist in search of the spiritual essence of pestilence (Frye *Anatomy*: 148). By exploring the sore-ridden exterior and exposing the internal bodily deformity brought on by a retributive plague, the anatomising satirist maintained he had the corporeal fodder required to substantiate his prescriptive calls for moral reform. In this sense, the satirical diatribes against plague were a print form of protest; a splenetic venting directed at the abuses of London in the most heavy-handed didacticism.

Abandoning Christian humility in favour of humilation, the satirist dissected a body described by Aemelia Lanyer as one "Spunne by that monster Sinne, and weav'd by Shame" (Lanyer 99). Having equated sin with the disfiguring nature of plague, or in the words of Thomas Brewer, "euery grosse sinne a sicknesse" (*LHM* 6), the sinful body was the embodiment of "grosse deformity" (Marston *Poems* 83). Such were "the deplored effectes of theyr sinnes within," Nashe mentioned in *Christes Teares Ouer Ierusalem* [1593]; ulcerations that would eventually manifest on the skin, marking the sufferer visibly defiled and infected (Nashe *Wks II*: 65).

As London's visible minority, the infected were easy targets for abuse and social sanctions. The plague body was not only shunned by virtue of its physical dissemblance, however. It was the body's spiritual deformities that the satyr anatomist found most abjectly distasteful. Samuel Rowlands expressed that there were both physical and spiritual "motiues to auoide such infectious plague-sores"

---

[4] Unfortunately, the misguided measures included public prayer and fasting, did little or nothing to slow the epidemic.

(Rowlands *Comp Wks I*: 43). One motive aimed to preserve mortal life and the other was directed at preserving eternal life. This was a impenitent body in "the poysonfullest iawes of death": not a sacred but a profane body (Nashe *Wks III*: 87). A virtual body whose moral disorders were allegorized as physiological disorders.

The infected body and its "scabby festers inwardly unsound" made the body the ideal didactic signifier (Hall *Coll Poems*: 26). Like an allegorical construct, the infected body had a double-meaning: a surface signification and interior connotations, where

> . . . but skin and film the ulcerous place,
> While rank corruption . . .
> Infects unseen." (*HAM* III iv 146-151)

In the anatomy, the infected body could be interpreted on several levels. There was its physical and spiritual realm, the interior and exterior of the body, and deciphering the body as a microcosmic mirror of the macrocosm (Neoplatonism). Through these multiple levels of meaning, plague fables were frequently allegorized to explain and justify the infection within the body, manufactured bodily myths based largely on dogmatic prophecies. The rhetorical strategy of the anatomy, therefore, zealously exploited the similarities between the deformed physical state of the body and its corrupt spiritual state.

The plague body articulated through the satirical anatomy was ultimately defined and positioned as an abject object. This "othering" of the infected sufferer forged a body which was both morally repugnant and physically repulsive. Through the rhetorical efforts of the anatomy, the infected body became early modern London's "grotesque interface,"[5] a dehumanized construct which gave genesis to an infected "them" versus an uninfected "us" satirical posturing. The deliberate dehumanization of the abject sufferer was made possible through the freakish ornamentation of the erupting body surface. But the disfigured landscape of the early modern plague body was not so much an anatomical representation as it was a moral mapping of stigmatic sores and polluting effluents. The exterior charting of this often surreal bodily topography brought further disgust and contempt upon the sufferer "blained with plague sores" because the physical aversion supported the abject disgust of the anatomy (Swadling 34-5). As the harshness of satirical description attested, the infected and the presumed infected were phobic creatures, shunned out of paranoid anxieties initiated by the so-called "leaprous filths" of their largely discursive affliction (*SOV* 26).[6] Like leprosy, the disciplinary response to plague was steeped in biblical tradition of Leviticus.[7] Through plague measures such as the shutting up of infected houses, *cordon sanitaire*, and quarantining in pest-houses, sufferers were not only surveilled but effectively shunned and incarcerated out of the social response: the disgust of "This cruell disease" (S.H. A5). For English writers of the early modern period, disgust was the "foul stigmatic," the last refuge of writers who were at a frustrating loss to explain the unexplainable and control the uncontrollable (*2H6* V. i. 215).

---

[5] Alton Robertson defines the "grotesque interface" as "a mediating principle in the confrontation between order and non-order." See Alton Robertson's *The Grotesque Interface: Deformity, Debasement, Dissolution*, 1.

In addition to reinforcing the abject status of the body, the anatomy also conveyed a grotesquely rhetorical image invoked for moralistic purposes. Infected with what the anatomist George Thomson referred to as "this horrid Monster," the legitimate anatomy, like its satirical adversary, could fashion a monstrous victim (*LPA* 53). Through a system of amplification, plague sufferers became the debased hosts of the most disgusting and contemptible early modern body. Much like its medieval equivalent, the infected body remained an emblazoned rhetorical site layered with abject signification. It was a body with "that hotrid, deformed, pestilential Idea imprinted in it" – with diabolical and grotesque shapes adorning its disfiguredly infected frame – a corrupt body which seemed to hellishly collapse in on itself (*LPA* 91). Through the combination of its sore and inconstant surface, the plague body was reduced to a repugnant mass of shame and humiliation.

---

[6] While plague was an infectious disease, it had "imagined" divine origins for the early moderns.
[7] See Leviticus 14:33-57.

"The speech-shunning sores and sight-ircking botches" (Nashe *Wks II*: 148) of pestilential infection were, therefore, the Renaissance badges of shame; incontrovertible proof of sin and divine retribution upon a body "Stigmatical in making" (*ERR* IV ii 22). This rhetoric of abject horror employed by the satyr-anatomist helped reduce the infected body to the most repellent of objects. The infected body, with its variegated surface, was clearly something to recoil from. The abject terror of the infected body was reiterated by Samuel Rowlands who warned that the conscience of the soul was also at peril to infection. As Rowlands explained in *Heavens glory, seeke it* [1628] of those who yield to wickedness: "thy wounded conscience bleeds within thee; thou seest nothing but terror, thou feelest nothing but horror," the anxiety of infection was echoed by many satirists (Rowlands 1628: 84). The infected body often defied description according to Edward Hake who complained of the inability to represent "Most ugsome shapes, and creatures, such / as I can not define" (Hake E5).

Displacing the physical body from the realms of realism and humanism, the anatomising satirist dissected symbolic bodies with misanthropic and misogynistic[8] bitterness and revulsion, vindictively tossing the grotesque remnants into the sphere of disgust. Bereft of moral character, bodies were "receptacles," used "many times for shamefull purposes" according to Barnaby Rich's dissective rants (Rich D2). Despite its ornate grotesqueries, however, the satirical agenda was a transparent one: transform epidemical London to a pious and plague-free city via the shaming anatomy of the infected body. This collective satirical response to the "*Pestiferous Deluge*" (*SDS* 47) was one of paranoia and providentialist fervour as the plague body became a site of infernal corruption; a human vessel capable of infecting others merely through its sinful social presence. The rhetorical intent of the anatomy was a cautionary dissection warning Londoners what pestilential misfortunes would befall their physical and spiritual state should they succumb to sin. In placing the blame for disease upon the sinner, the satirist also foregrounded the citizen's personal responsibility to the culture. Echoing the sentiments of other satirical writers, George Wither argued that the Lord deliberately sought out and infected "Bodies," whose "flesh and bloud" were "suiect to sinning" (*ASW* 17), or, as Caspar Huebert warned: "wanton, filthy livers [would] be taken by God, and punished very straungly" with pestilence (Huebert 89). Generally speaking, then, infection struck, to negate Judith Butler's phrase – "bodies that didn't matter" – bodies that were worthy of infection by virtue of their sinful constitutions – bodies that were worthy of the shame, blame, and guilt lashed upon them via the satirical anatomy.

---

[8] Within the narrow scope of this non-gendered study, I am unable to include the wealth of misogynist indictments articulated in the anatomies. At some point beyond this study, I intend to produce an article-length paper which solely addresses misogyny and the scapegoating of women in early modern plague discourse.

Operating on the assumption that plague was poetic, or, more specifically, retributive justice, the satyr-anatomist considered plague a spiritually purging social illness, where the morally and spiritually inferior were cut down by the Lord's wrath. "For God there were no accidents," as David Hartley points out, "sickness did not come by chance but was sent as a fatherly correction by God either to punish wickednes or as a trial of faith."[9] The early modern satirists wrote under the assumption that their angry God knew what he was doing even when mass mortality seemed to be unselective at best.[10] God sought out those, who, John Dod suggested, "oft defile their soules and bodies with many horrible pollutions" because "flesh is wholly bent vnto that which is sinfull": the greater the sin, the more severe the affliction (Dod 124 & 44).

Within the satirical anatomy, the plague body became a sacrificial construct. Through the recurring "visitations," the sacred body was made profane by a disfiguring moral and mortal infection. For the satyr-anatomist, the body was not only a receptacle of filth, but a receptacle of disease. A host for sin and infection, the body was a dirty and contagious source of plague, or to use Thomas Nashe's metaphor, human bodies were little more than "stincking dungeons for diseases to dwell in"; "Bodies we bumbast and balist with engorging diseases" (Nashe *Wks II*: 154 & 147). "Bumbasting" infected bodies, of course, meant placing blame on the sufferer for disease.

Pestilence 'Character'd in Blame': The Infectious Scapegoat

In an unrelenting rhetoric of blame, satirists collectively unleashed what they defined as their own God-given wrath[11] upon sufferers and sinners. Through the anatomy's tacit insistence on blaming others for infection, the phobic abjection of sinners and plague sufferers served to reinforce the harsh social response to pestilence. The propensity for what René Girard describes as a "sacred drama of blame," was the predominate driving force behind the anatomy (Girard *Scapegoat*: 82). Within the anatomy, the infected were berated for bringing God's tokens not only upon them selves but to the detriment of London as a whole. The role of the satyr-anatomist was, according to Wither, to "tell how others are to blame" while sustaining that moral reproach "in a Christian feare" (*BRII* 566). The god-fearing satirist was, of course, not only inspired by plague, but by the shame and guilt morality that was a central part of the Christian church.[12] According to Edward Hake's *Newes out of Powles Churchyarde* [1579], no Londoners were "voyde of blame" in the anatomy (Hake G4). In scapegoating the infected, the anatomy symbolically hacked the ulcerated masses into abject dross. These bodily remnants – these aversive dregs, were to serve as augeries of "deserved shame" – a phobic warning to Londoners to avoid infection by avoiding sin (*BRII*: 561).

---

[9] See David Harley's "Spiritual Physic, Providence and English Medicine, 1560-1640" in Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham's *Medicine and the Reformation*, 101.

[10] As John More articulated in *A Lively Anatomie of Death* [1596], "we see our flesh apte to receiue a wound, yet euery one is not wounded. The body of man is subiect to sicknesse, yet many often dye, not subiect to sicknesse" (More B8).

[11] As Paul Slack notes, "The Christian notions of original sin and divine chastisement therefore predisposed men to action: to search out the targets of epidemics, often to find scapegoats, but also to identify the physical as well as moral sources of disease." See Paul Slack's "Introduction" in *Epidemics and Ideas: Essays on the Historical Perception of Pestilence*, 17.

Indicative of their fierce temper, satirical anatomists regularly shamed and berated the infected for bringing the Lord's wrath of plague upon London. Most early moderns, like their medieval forbears, still considered plagues "divine visitations": the diseased vengeance of an angry God. For Renaissance satirists, epidemics were, therefore, more moral than physical, more focused on the supernatural wrath of God and generally dismissive of Naturian[13] principles of disease. Within the anatomy, the sinful plague sufferer was much like the medieval leper: a stigmatised person to be shunned and avoided.[14]

---

[12] See Theodor Rosebury's *Life on Man*, 70.

[13] The *OED* defines "Naturian" as an interchangable term for "a natural philosopher; a believer in nature as contrasted with divine providence." See *OED Vol. XI*.

[14] See Saul Brody's *The Disease of the Soul: Leprosy in Medieval Literature*, 107.

The phobic response, or "Christian feare" of plague, articulated by Wither, was a universal one (*BRII*: 566). As John Donne bemoaned, "A long sicknesse will weary friends at last, but a pestilential sicknes averts them from the beginning," there was good reason to be paranoid about plague (Donne *Sel Prose*: 98). With mortality rates sometimes nearing 25%,[15] mass mortality was an undeniable fact and a harsh reality that prompted the wealthy, and those who were able, to abandon the city. Given the context, the overwhelming paranoia and scapegoating of the infected body was not only justifiable, but socially acceptable.[16] "Of all Diseases wherento the Body of Man is subject," wrote William Kemp, "the Plague is one of the most venemous and most infectious," the social response to the disease and its victims was also often "venemous" (*ABT* 1). While neither Kemp nor his medical contemporaries truly understood how the contagion really functioned, Kemp, like many others, recognized that association with the infected increased the likelihood of infection. The creation of plague regulations, the enforcement of quarantine and *cordon sanitaire*, and the construction of pesthouses were a direct result of this warranted and Levitican-inspired paranoia that was espoused by James Manning and others.[17]

In the wake of infection, early modern London was what might be best described as a divinely punished city, but by the same token it was also a punitive culture; as evidenced by the retaliatory stance of the casuistic satirist and the obstructionistic laws created to help control and reduce mortality. Strongly influenced by the biblical dogma of plague, Renaissance London's reactionary response to epidemic was dictated by myth and ignorance of aetiology. Despite satirical and civic misguidedness, however, the pestilential angst of the early modern period was justified because, whether natural philosopher or masterless man, all were ignorant of the scientific cause of plague and its transmission. Dread, more so than common sense, often dictated the popular religious perspectives of plague, affecting public policy and the inadequate management of epidemic.

---

[15] Paul Slack notes that in 1563, London experienced a mortality rate of 24%. In 1603 and in 1625, the city suffered mortality rates of 22.6% and 20.1% respectively. See Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 375-76.

[16] As Keith Thomas also points out, that "the mockery of deformity, deviance and inferior status was socially accepted in the culture of Tudor and Stuart England" (Thomas 126).

[17] James Manning voiced the paranoia of the age in *A new booke, intituled, I am for you all, Complexions castle* [1604]. According to Manning:

> May not they be condemned for murtherers, which haue ague soares, will presse into companies to infect others, or wilfully pollute the ayre, or other means, which others are daily to vse and liue by? The word of God commanded the leper to haue his head bare, a couering for his lippes, his garments burnt, and to crie, I am vncleane. Leuit. I.3.45. (Manning 2)

At the peak of epidemic, early modern London was in disciplined disarray. "The Plague Orders," though helpful in theory, were often misguided and rarely used successfully. Civic corruption by those meting out the orders was rife. Fumigating fires, fasting and prayer were unfortunately all but useless in abating infection. As the numbers on the "Bills of Mortality" increased, so too did state and satirical hostility towards the infected in the chaos and the panic of epidemic when "Unemployment, food shortage, looting and violence usually resulted" (Thomas 8). The draconian legal response to the disease somewhat mirrored the invective reprisals of the anatomy. When enacted in 1604, the Plague Act set a precedent in the "fight" against pestilence. Although the statute had two aims: "the charitable relief and ordering of persons infected with the Plague," it was the "ordering" of the infected which exposed the disciplinary violence against the infected scapegoats (Slack 1990: 211). Slack notes,

> Watchmen now had legal authority to use 'violence' to keep people shut up. Anyone with a plague sore found wandering outside in the company of others was guilty of felony and might be hanged; anyone else going out could be whipped as a vagrant rogue. (Ibid. 211)

The tools of discipline included the "whipping-postes and other terrible engines,

[that] were aduanced in euery street to send the home bleeding new, if they were take wandring (like sheep broken out of leane pastures into fat) out of their own liberties," that Dekker alluded to in *Worke For Armourours* [1609] (*PPD* 109). Suspicion and accusation were rampant not only in the culture[18] but especially within the satirical realm. The voice of complaint was, therefore, also the voice of discipline and rage.

To fight plague on their own terms, London satirists had to locate or create a nefarious source of infection. Predictably, sinners and sin proved the most popular targets. In hindsight, of course, they should have targeted the rat – whose fleas carried the deadly bacillus, – but without the advantages and insights of modern science, they focused their invective attentions on vice. Through "some wanton words [of] blame," the satirists sought to bring order in a tense and disturbing state of affairs and some logical grounding to justify their paranoia of a toxic enemy within the city walls: plague (Guilpin 52).

Satirical apprehensiveness could also transcend the city walls. Within the hysteria of epidemic, placing blame had a unifying xenophobic edge as well. Plague was not only blamed on sinful Londoners, but on outsiders as well. Somewhat similar to the way in which anti-Semitism functioned in the works of Martin Luther, the satyr-anatomist used analogous rhetoric to blame the infected Londoners and foreigners for bringing the disease into the city. Just as Luther considered the presence of Jews in Germany pestilential – "a heavy burden, a plague, a pestilence, a sheer misfortune for our country"[19] – the satirist blamed pestilent Londoners for the

---

[18] As Slack notes,

> Plague could inflame old resentments and be used as a weapon to pay off old scores between neighbours. They refused to bury one another's dead, and accused one another of bringing infection into a street. To allege that someone was infected was as powerful a local slander as the accusation that a man's wife was a whore. (Slack 293)

[19] Martin Luther is cited in Alan Dunde's *Life is Like a Chicken Coop Ladder: A Portrait of German Culture Through Folklore*, 124.

"sharpe visitation of the Lorde" (*CSC* A8). On occasion, other more Catholic countries such as France[20] and Ireland[21] were blamed for exporting their filthy religions and the disease of its followers into London. In the spirit and tradition of hostility, however, Catholic supporters had also blamed plagues on the Reformation.[22] In Defoe's *A Journal of the Plague Year* [1721], the Dutch were blamed,[23] as were Dutch and Walloon refugees from the Netherlands in the late-sixteenth-century Norwich.[24] London's poor were also frequently cited for spreading plague,[25] but the sinful remained the primary target for satirical invective.

In spite of the dubiousness of their allegations, satirical writers promoted increased hostilities towards the infected. The anatomy's morbid analysis of the plague body suggests that moral violations were made manifest through bodily violations. The shock and sensationalism of the suffering process and the disrupting force on the body offered the satirical anatomist his poetic license to dissect and attack misanthropically. This phobic reaction towards the infected sufferers is what René Girard describes as "negative reciprocity."[26] For Girard, cultures in crisis throughout history have had a pronounced tendency to ignore natural causes by fostering a corollary denial, that being the propensity to explain disease through social and moral causes.[27] Considering the wealth of satirical literature on plague, there was a dogmatic denial of we postmodernists would define as natural causes. The early modern satirist's phobic reaction to plague, therefore, reconfirms Girard's cultural analysis. The satirical anatomy generated persecution texts,[28] literary works aimed at not only locating a source for epidemic but charged with an accusatory timbre for blaming. Focusing their vindictive attentions upon the sinful sufferer and the infected, the satyr-anatomist stooped to new creative depths in order to vent his misanthropic spleen. Indeed, though plague was the "Disease" that "dost thou molest," the anatomy "molested" the infected body further by manufacturing and dissecting a monstrous and blameworthy source of infection (Jonson *Wks*: 93).

---

[20] In *Newes from Graues-ende* [1604], Dekker complained sarcastically: "Smile at this plague, and black mischance, / Knowing their deaths come o're from France" (*PPD* 99). Similarly, Defoe also voices the hostility directed at the French for spreading their disease:

> Beginning of December 1664, when two Men, said to be French-men, died of Plague in Long Acre, or rather at the upper End of Drury-Lane. The Family they were in, endeavour'd to conceal it as much as possible; but as it had gotten some Vent in the Discourse of the Neighbourhood, the Secretaries of State got Knowledge of it. (Defoe 1-2)

[21] Slack discloses that "In Liverpool in 1558 there was 'great murmur and noise that the plague should be brought in . . . by an Irish man . . . coming sickly from Manchester . . .'" See Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 292.

[22] See Keith Thomas's *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, 96.

[23] According to Defoe's reconstruction, "It matter'd not, from whence it come; but all agreed, it was come into Holland again" (Defoe 1).

[24] See Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 127 & 272-73.

[25] Ibid., 292.

[26] While Girard's methodology considered the social reactions of ancient cultures, his enthnographical conception aptly applies to early modern London as well. See *The Scapegoat*, 14.

To legitimize and justify the fatalist claims of retributive epidemics, satirists and clerics alike sought out diseased scapegoats. And while plague was about sin, the rhetoric of the anatomy was largely about shaming and blaming. Of course, the misanthropic tradition of reproach was not an invention of the early modern satirist, but part of the historical tradition of the human condition. As Dorothy Nelkin and Sander Gilman remind us, "blaming has always been a means to make mysterious and devastating diseases comprehensible and therefore possibly controllable" (Mack 40). Ignorance of the source of any human crisis, especially epidemic disease, breeds suspicion, contempt and paranoia. These were desperate times as the savage rhetoric of blame suggests. In response to the reproachful nature of the satirist, the anatomy conveyed "a shame morality" in admonitory tracts that cultivated shame by arguing by bad example (Miller *Anatomy*: 198). Thomas Beard's *The Theatre of Gods Iudgements* [1597] explained that Londoners were "blameable for glutting and ouercharging themselves with sins" (Beard 462). The anatomy, therefore, duly reacted with fierce recriminations, attacking a variety of "filthy vices" that were responsible for bringing the divine wrath of plague into the city (*MM* II vi 42). A few of the more prominent moral crimes the satirist railed against for London's misfortunes, included sex, lechery and whoring, as well as the vices of alcohol, tobacco, swearing, attending plays,[29] and gambling. As Richard Rawlidge put it, London:

---

[27] Ibid., 14.

[28] Although Girard speaks of the violence of persecution in *The Scapegoat*, I am using violence here in a more rhetorical sense. As the anatomy was a symbolic one, so is the violence within the satirical anatomy.

> being pestered and filled with many great and crying sinnes, which were first hatched, and are ever since fostered and maintained, in Play-houses, Ale-houses Bawdy-houses, Dicing-houses, otherwise stiled Ordinaries, or which are the most Receptacles of all manner of basenesse and ludenesse, is hard to be distinguisht. (Rawlidge 2)

If the moralising physician, Stephen Bradwell, could argue that "Drunkenesse and Crudities" could "breed new diseases" it is hardly surprising that the wealth of urban vice inspired satirical rage (*WMP* 31). As the anatomy elucidated, early modern London was a filthy urban space where "garbage" meant the sexually corrupt, where liberty intimated sexual license, and where "uncleanness" suggested fornication.[30] The opposition between the lapsed moral state of Renaissance London and the utopian ideal projected by the anatomy were worlds apart. The satirical conception for a plague-free London was a rather sombre and puritanical antithesis: a Utopia with enough mortifying hair shirts for all.

It was through shame that the anatomising satirist hoped sufficiently to degrade his readership and, ultimately, the populace into a sort of pious recovery which would inevitably lead London into an epidemical-free existence. Shame – even in Robert Burton's estimation – was the most powerful rhetorical method for effecting positive social change. In Burton's opinion, it was not the lingering ache of a bubo or the gnawing smite of a carbuncle, but rather, it was "Shame and disgrace [that could] cause most violent passions and bitter pangs" on the body (*AM Pt 1 Sec 2*: 228). Burton seemed to suggest in his own symbolic anatomy, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* [1621], that the metaphysical effects of shame upon the Christian Londoner were not only more figuratively mutilating, but ultimately more injurious than the physical effects plague. The shame-based scolding, berating, and indicting of the infected was conveyed in satirical rhetoric exclusively void of hope, goodness and redemption.

---

[29] In *A Sermon preached at Pawles Crosse* [1578], Thomas White argued, "the cause of plagues are playes" (White 46-47).

[30] See Gordon Williams' *A Glossary of Shakespeare's Sexual Language*, 136, 186 & 318.

In shaming God, the infected sinner brought blame upon himself and pestilential wrath upon London. The physician and dramatist Thomas Lodge, for example, suggested it was "The mightinesse of these fond peoples sinnes" that did the Lord "inflict a world of plagues" (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 8). Apart from the god-fearing invectives of satirical writers, however, even a paramedical treatise like Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, was quick to point out that penance, not medicine or quarantine, was the most expedient path to ending infection. Simply put, "When the sinners repents," wrote Burton, "then God relents" (*AM Pt 3 Sec 4*: 952). As Burton's excerpt illustrates the satirical imagination manufactured and sustained the deceit of infection. By interpreting scriptural passages relevant to epidemic,[31] writers attacked what they considered to be the abuses and abusers of London, grotesquely fashioning these infected scapegoats in the process. The hermenuetics of pestilence dictated that if there were an infectious leviathan, the morally or physically deformed sinner infected with plague was it. Such was the state of the "stained blemish, character'd in blame" in the anatomy (Middleton *Wks VIII:* 114). With its stigmatic scars, the blemished body was not only an abject construct, but a bruised and broken body. It was a wounded body whose discursive character would suffer further hurt and humiliation through the reviling temperament of the anatomy. As the next section articulates, the satyr-anatomist took particular pleasure in cataloguing the infectious pattern of sores in petulant detail.

---

[31] While there are a number of allusions and proverbial passages related to plague, two of the most popular references made to the Bible in Renaissance satire include: the plagues in Egypt (Exod. 7:14-12:32); the plagues of Israel (Num. 11:33; 31:16; Josh. 22:17; 2 Sam. 24:15; 2 Chr. 21:14; Ps. 106:29), and the plagues of David for numbering his people (2 Samuel 25 and I Chronicles 11) For a detailed reference to other Biblical plagues, see A. Colin Day's *Roget's Thesaurus of the Bible*, 457.

'Bodies Making Anatomies in Wounds' or the Taxonomy of Sores

As a wounded discursive construct, the suppurating sores which riddled the surface of the infected body were regularly likened to bruises and lacerations for many obvious and some not-so-obvious reasons. Indeed, what especially harmonized "the Inuectiue vain" of the satirical anatomy with the providential wrath of plague was the cruel and painful violence each hostile force inflicted on the infected body (Harvey 30). Within the anatomy, sores and "sins [were] ransacked, sifted, searched, & ripped vp" (*AMS* D2) from symbolic bodies with rhetorical ferocity, and, "like some torturing engine," the "Dreadfull Justice" of pestilence also scattered symbolic brutality on corporeal bodies (Herbert 141). Whether through "the pricking of the poynte of a small needle" or "the launcing of a great raser," the anatomist waged his own discursive dissection of the infected body (*ATT* 77). Without question, the anatomy's intersecting of the corporeal with the symbolic generated an intimidating and persuasive concept of infection for a culture ignorant of the pathology of pestilence. Although plague was physically threatening, as the anatomy made explicit, plague was, more importantly, spiritually devastating.

The satirical anatomy maintained that providential forces inflicted the corporeal and spiritual harm of plague. In response to the chaos and violence of epidemic, the satirist set out to impose scriptural meaning on London's recurring "visitations"[32] largely through scriptural allegories.[33] As Gordon Teskey argues, allegory's "essence is violence, emerging from chaos to impose schematic order on historical process" (Teskey 76), the violent "essence" of plague was particularly well-grounded in an early modern context where scriptural allegory was coupled with the historical and material conditions of epidemic. Out of the disorder of outbreak, the anatomy attempted to impose taxonomic order on the infected body vexed with providential "tokens." The taxonomy of sores was predominately, therefore, an allegorical taxonomy.

While infectious plague ulcers and tumors appeared on "the distressed Fabricke" of the corporeal body surface, the satyr-anatomist sought not for natural causes but rather, the allegorical origins of plague (A.H. 57). To help us understand the satirical propensity to locate the emblematic violence of "thy cruell plague" (Anderson B4) from a scriptural perspective, Henry Holland's *Spirituall Preservatives against the pestilence* [1593] offers an ideal Renaissance paragon. In this tract, Holland elaborated upon the typological origins of "Pestilence," which, as he explained, were named in "2. Sa.24.21.25. *Magephah*, which signifieth great smiting, and grieuous beating, [and] of *Nagaph*, to smite and beate to death" (*SPA* 19). Persuasive or not, Holland's hermeneutic investigations into pestilence deciphered the essence of allegorical violence within the anatomy. The "smiting" and "beating" to death of infected bodies "vexed with paine" that Holland unveiled through his scriptural etymology, was reiterated through much of the discourse of the anatomy (Birch 1) . "My plagues shall beat you to the grounde," announced the Lord in *A passing bell towling to call us to mind* [1593] was a representative example of the unrestrained, divine violence inherent in the anatomy (Passing Bell 1). Henoch Clapham reinforced Holland's position in *An Epistle Discovrsing vpon the present Pestilence* [1603], by pointing out that "Plague . . . [wa]s a word of large use," within the anatomy (Clapham 1603: B1). Indeed, speculation was stifled since meaning was rigidly defined within scriptural parameters. Providentialism was the ideological mainstay of the anatomy: "God in Sacred Scripture [wa]s made the Author of the Plague" (*LGP* 16), wrote William Boghurst. The origins of plague would not be found in the translated works of Hippocrates or Galen, therefore, but in scripture, because, as Holland explained, "The bookes of God giue the Pestilence many names, some proper, some borrowed and metaphoricall, which may helpe vs with some light to discerne the causes of this terrible destroyer of mankinde" (*SPA* 15). Regardless of the infectious epithet, however, Holland and his satirical contemporaries maintained that sin and divine vengeance were the plague vectors, not Fracastorian "fomites"[34] or some humoural imbalance.[35]

---

[32] "Visitation" was a well-used term in the anatomy used to convey the providential essence of epidemic. See the *OED Vol. XVIII.*

[33] Unlike Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* [1687], the allegorical force of the anatomy was concerned more with Christian damnation than salvation. Some of the representative allegories in the anatomy of plague include: Thomas Nashe's *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem* [1593]; John Godskall's *The Arke of Noah, For the Londoners that remaine in the Cittie to enter in with their families, to be preserued from the deluge of the Plague* [1604]; Thomas Adams' *Englands Sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels* [1615]; Francis White's *Dead Souls* [1619]; Thomas Brewer's *The Weeping Lady: Or, London Like Ninivie in Sack-Cloth* [1625]; J.D.'s *Salomons Pest-House, or Towre-Royall* [1630]; and John Trapp's *Gods Love-Tokens and the Afflicted Mans Lessons: Brought to light, and sayd before him in two fruitfull and seasonable Discourses upon Revel, 3.19* [1637].

---

[34] By 1546, Girolamo Fracastorius [1483-1553], in his tractate *On Contagion*, was using the term "fomite" to explain the phenomena of contagion. As Geddes Smith notes, disease could, according to Fracastor

> occur by contact through fomites (that is, neutral articles like wool or rags which were not themselves susceptible to the effects of contagion, but could receive it, hold it, and give it off unchanged), and at a distance through the air. Contagion was a sort of putrefaction passing from one thing to another; the seminaria or seed-pods which carried it could reproduce their kind, but Fracastor twice compares this process with the propagation of the vital spirits — whatever they were — and so falls short of identifying it clearly with anything we should recognize as the facts of life. (Smith 38)

See Geddes Smith's *Plague On Us*, 38 & 86; Benjamin Lee Gordon's *Medieval and Renaissance Medicine*, 706; and N.F. Stanley and R.A. Joske's *Changing Disease Patterns and Human Behaviour*, 555.

Having denounced the high-minded Naturian notions of contagion, the satirical anatomy adhered to more orthodox conceptions of pestilence: defining epidemics as the embodiment of intolerable yet defensible holy violence. The tenor of divine wrath resonated in the moral opprobrium of the satirist who justified his invective anatomy as both necessary and violent, because the pestilence that "strangled and slew many" (*SPA* B30) like "oxen to the slaughter" was also vindictively baneful (Heron 46). The satirist's "cankered verdit of malignant hate" was, therefore, merely an emulation of the wrath of the Author of all things in words rather than by deeds (*SOV* 2). An anonymous pamphlet of 1620 entitled *The painefvll hand: shall rvle the lande*, argued that plague was delivered by the "painefull hand" of the Lord, much in the way that the anatomy was driven by the painful hand of the writer "who [also] raged sore in bitter words" (Spenser *Shorter Poems* 370).

In *The Seuen deadly Sins of London* [were] *drawn in seueral coaches, through the seuen seueral gates of the City; bringing the plague with them*[1606], Dekker argued it was the satirist's responsibility to expose the "Sins" which brought providential vengeance upon the city. Despite the high mortality rates of epidemic, providential "visitations" were, nevertheless, defended as "iust wrath" (Day 109) – rationalised as "the Material cause of Gods anger" -- an anger inflicted on London to effect moral change by eliminating sin and sinners (Clapham 1603: B3). The interventionist explanation for pestilence was based largely on Biblical myths. Given the historical context and the phobic reaction to the disease, however, scriptural interpretations of plague were decidely persuasive just the same. In Nashe's allegorical construction of London, *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem* [1593], Nashe conveyed that "The wrath of GOD is kindled in euery corner of the Citty" – a quick glance at the Weekly Mortality Bills, the sight or stench of a plague pit, or the sound of the constant tolling of the bell, could confirm Nashe's mimetic exegesis (Nashe *Wks II*: 71), and the similar social terrors expressed in Bullein's *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578].[36]

---

[35] Humoural imbalance was generally considered by the medical profession as "the fourth cause of plague" (Wilson 6). In *A treatise of the pestilence* [1603], Thomas Thayre, for example, spoke of "those bodies wherein there is Cacochymia, corrupt and superfluous humours abounding, are apt and lightly infected, those humours being themselues inclined and disposed unto putrifaction" (*ATP* B1). Within humoural theory, as Paul Slack adds, "those of a sanguine constitution were most vulnerable to plague (Slack 1990: 28). See also W.S.C. Copeman's *Doctors and Disease in Tudor Times*, 116; David Hoeniger's *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*, 102-07; and Nancy Siraisi's *Medieval & Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice*, 104-6.

God's reactionary violence was ultimately well-intended and merciful; a near-apocalyptic response that aimed to reestablish a new Christian order amid the chaos of epidemic. The sacred violence and mortality of epidemic were destructive to be certain, but the wrathful God remained beyond reproach because the anatomy reasoned that the Almighty dispensed pestilence in kind and in kindness. Some writers considered plague sores to be, as the title of John Trapp's pamphlet suggested, *Gods Love-Tokens* [1637]. According to John Davies, "Cruelty sometimes is Clemencie," the Lord worked not only in mysterious ways, but in particularly barbarous ways as well (*MC* 109). The anatomy sustained a cataclysmic sense of despair because of the social and the spiritual conditions of the "sin-drownd world" known as London (Guilpin 58).

The high mortality and suffering of epidemic also made the experience difficult to capture and record. Indeed, Defoe would ask in the following century, "What can be said to represent the Misery of these Times?" (Defoe 77). Similarly, early modern writers faced a formidable task in trying to capture the wrathful essence of epidemic. In spite of the disclaimers, however, there was much to be said in the anatomy about the virulent nature of plague tokens and the "misery of these times."

---

[36] Bullein's character, Civis, encapsulates the visceral angst of epidemic. As Civis said:

> Good wife, the daiely ianglyng and ryngīng of the belles, the commyng in of the minister to euery house in minstryng the communion, in readyng the Homelie of Death, the diggyng vp of graues, the sparring in of windowes, & the blasyng forth of the blewe crosse, doee make my harte tremble & quake. (*DFP* 56)

The dread that resonated in Defoe's reconstruction of the Great Plague,[37] for example, pervaded the discourse of the early modern anatomy. A frustrated Robert Wright expressed the authorial futility when he complained that "the terrour of Gods wrath is so terrible as no man can expresse it" (Wright 19). In *A Sermon preached at Pawles Crosse* [1578], Thomas White confessed a similar sense of helplessness when he described his unsettling interaction with an infected sufferer: "I saw the head diseased, and finding the whole body in the same pickle, I knew not what to do" (White 9). Like White, many writers witnessed the sufferer's unsettling descent into death – "The writhing of the lippes, the turning of the neck[,] the buckling of the ioynts and the whole body . . . cramps and convulsions" (Perkins 1595: 16). For the Water-poet, John Taylor, the sin and disease of London was too much to bear: "shutting up the two shop windows of my Microcosme," wrote Taylor, "I presently set a Nappe upon my threadbare eyes" (Taylor *Wks II*: 1). While Taylor tried to ignore "the terrour of Gods wrath," most satirists kept their eyes and noses open and their quills ready, because of their instinctual need to moralise pestilence and its tokens (Wright 19). According to the satirist A.H. describing London – "My trembling Quill . . . doth hast to write" – London's satirical anatomists had a sore and plaguy muse for inspiration.

In its rigidly dogmatic fashion, the anatomy was grounded on the premise that "Gods deadly tokens" were "sent forth promiscuously to all sinners" for their transgressions (Hastler 40). Those "spotted and defiled with sinne," would inevitably find themselves spotted and defiled with plague tokens (*SPT* 18). Vice and sin demanded divine violence and these "plague tokens of the Lord's wrath" would most often, as Thomas Hastler conferred, "take a deadly impression in thy body" (Hastler 10). Of course, the etymology of "plague" further supported the premise of divine violence, because the Latin form of the word, *plagare*, as well as the Medieval English form, *plaghen*, meant "to strike."[38] By virtue of the appearance of sores and the reality of epidemic, plague was a violent and threatening word for the early moderns.

---

[37] In *A Journal of the Plague Year*, Daniel Defoe, like Wright, expressed his own inability to describe the "horrors" of epidemic. In the words of Defoe: "it is impossible to say any Thing that is able to give a true Idea of it to those who did not see it, other than this; that it was indeed very, very, very dreadful, and such no Tongue can express" (Defoe 60). Like Wright, however, Defoe, nevertheless, went on to describe his reconstructed epidemic in "very, very, very" great detail.

While there was satirical unanimity with respect to the cause of allegorical violence – a wrathful God – there was some debate to how the sacred violence was meted out. "The Pest," argued Henoch Clapham, was "the violence of Gods devouring Angell" (Clapham 1604: A4). Sampson Price, on the other hand, likened plague "symptomes" to "A Dragon tearing in pieces with all violence" (Price 32-33). Henry Petowe explained the phenomenon of plague tokens as oppressively inclement weather, wherein "the Viall of my Fathers anger burst forth, and the blew blacke drops thereof sprinkled on the bodyies" of the infected (Petowe 11). A wealth of providentialist theories circulated within the anatomies. But much like the divine bruises or unyielding wounds they were imagined to be, God's tokens indubitably transcended the fragility of the corporeal flesh. In *Two Godly and Learned Treatises* [1635], John Preston expressed the satirical position best when he wrote, "There may be in the body of man many great gashes, and deepe wounds, and yet be cured; but if the affliction lies on the Creature from the wrath of God, he is not able to beare it" (Preston 173). The unbearable burden of God's tokens perforated both body and soul with grievous consequences, for "Sicknesses in mens Soules," as Thomas Adams argued, "are bred like diseases in naturall, or corruptions in ciuill bodies" (*DOS* 2). These "ciuill" wounds were the result of uncivil acts, sins, to be more precise.

---

[38] See *OED* Vol. II, 948.

The stigmatic tokens which marked the sufferer's flesh were typically defined as violent contusions and abrasions. In fact, "The black & blew stripes of the plague" Dekker was predisposed to describing, often resembled the mortal wounds of battle (*PPD* 38-39). Dekker, of course, was not a solitary scribe in this respect, because many other satyr-anatomists used metaphors of war to catalogue the mortality of epidemic as if it were armed aggression. When the miasmatic smoke of conflict dissipated over the "flesh-manured earth" (Nashe *Wks II*: 61), it seemed as if early modern London was a poorly-equipped hospital for fallen soldiers and foul sinners: a "Pest-house full of Sores and Diseases" (*LHM* 19). Amid epidemic, London's recurring "dreadful visitations" often resembled divine "invasions" with heavy casualties duly noted in the weekly Mortality Bills. The metaphors of battle in the "fight" against disease was, of course, a time-honoured one. As Elaine Scarry notes, "The relation between God and human beings is often mediated by the sign of the weapon" and the anatomy was especially prone to militaristic imagery when deciphering the hostile conditions of outbreak (Scarry 182). During epidemics, London was under siege -- not from some conquering nation -- but under attack by an invisible warrior[39] who discharged his infectious arrows, rods, thunderbolts, and"Gun-shot" upon London. Epidemical London[40] was the setting for a "Contagious Quarrell" (*PPD* 108-9) between "our English Israel" (J.D. A4) and "God" as Thomas Dekker and the author of ***Salomons Pest-Hovse*** [1630] envisioned it. Of course, using the soldiery as an intrinsic medium for interpreting epidemic, was not as far fetched as it seemed, since infected soldiers not only dispatched plague to foreign lands, but they also imported infectious disease back with them from conquered countries. Indeed, the spoils of war could be equally despoiling as the anonymous play, *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* demonstrated.[41] Although the early moderns didn't understand the pathology, they also recognised plague's potential as a biological weapon with God mostly on England's side and sometimes not.

---

[39] Though there was limited unanimity among satirists, the anatomy identified two likely candidates responsible for the infectious carnage: the Lord himself, or one of his "Angels."

[40] The notion of foreign invasion fits in with the etymology of "epidemic," which, as Julia Epstein notes "in its Greek origin, *epidêmos*, signifies the arrival of a foreigner." See Julia Epstein's *Altered Conditions: Disease, Medicine, and Storytelling*, 158.

Of all satyr-anatomists to explore the limits of the battle metaphor, Dekker was the master. Throughout his numerous plague pamphlets, Dekker likened epidemic to war as he dissected "Bodies making Anatomies in Wounds" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks III*: 45). In Dekker's allegorical scheme, plague was no ordinary battle. It was bloody all right, but unconventional by military standards – plague was an allegorical epic – a Holy War of sorts, with necessary casualties cut down in the "Epidemiall confusion of Wounds" (*PPD* 137). In this one-sided allegorical battle, plague was typically envisaged as a conflict between unarmed sinners and the very well-armed Almighty. Dekker, for example, set the stage for the epidemical siege in *A Rod for Run-awayes* [1625] this way:

> Wee are now in a set Battaile; the Field is *Great Britaine*, the Vantguard (which stands the brunt of the Fight) is *London*: the Shires, Counties and Countries round about it, we are in danger to be prest, & to come vp in the Reare: the King of Heauen and Earth is the Generall of the Army. (*PPD* 140)

As Dekker explained, the fate of the entire realm would be determined by London's successes or failures of eliminating sin, and the odds were certainly not in the city's favour. For the imaginative Dekker, plague was more than a disease, it was war personified.

---

[41] In *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, biological warfare was fashioned as a radical mercenary tactic to be used against France: "And I pray you, as ye travel up into High France, send the plague and the pox and as many diseases you can down into the country to kill the people, that I may get money for their graves-making" (xv 152-156).

Continuing with his battle metaphor, Dekker animated plague with a perversely violent inhumanity. In his black-humoured tract, *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603], for example, plague sores became anthropomorphised as mercenary soldiers of plague, wherein "the Plague is Muster-maister and Marshall of the field: Burning Feauers, Boyles, Blaines, and Carbuncles, the Leaders, Lieutenants, Serieants, and Corporalls" (*PPD* 31). Likely inspired by William Bullein's character "Soarnes," from *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578], Dekker's army of sores sacked London, leaving the epidemical city suppurating and desolate. As the personified "Pestilence" attested in Dekker's Menippean satire, *The Meeting of Gallants at an Ordinarie* [1604]: "many aliue / Can show their skars in my Contagious Quarrell," but many more carried their mortal wounds and disfiguring scars to the plague-pits with them in this "purple Battaile" (*PPD* 108-09).

Fashioning plague sores as battle wounds was a prominent Dekkerian trope in *Newes from Graues-Ende* [1604]. In this tract, for example, "death & his army of pestilent Archers," "like so many bullets flying" struck their targets, making their victims', as Dekker expressed in *The Meeting of Gallants at an Ordinarie* [1604],

> Groines sore pier'st with pestilentiall Shot:
> Their Arme-pits digd with Blaines, and vlcerous Sores,
> Lurking like poysoned Bullets in their flesh
> Othersome shot in the eye with Carbuncles,
> The Lids as monstrous as the Sarazens. (*PPD* 73, 85 & 109)

In *The Meeting of Gallants*, Dekker reconfigured buboes, which struck the "Groines" and "Arme-pits," like a pestilential salvo of infectious "Shot" and "Bullets." While some Londoners were indiscriminately caught in the crossfire, it was the marked and tokened sinners who increasingly fell victim to God's infectious artillery. What is also striking about Dekker's allegorical battle is that he likened the "carbunckled" eyes of the wounded sufferers to "Sarazens," the Muslim invaders of the Christian world, a real threat in the sixteenth century. The historical allusion to the Saracens is double-edged. Dekker's slight smacks of an Islamic Jihad or holy war against a Christian God, while, at the same time, his inference equates the infected sufferers with heretical Muslims who are void of Christian principles – yet full of Christian sin – like doomed foreign heretics fighting against God.[42] Of course, London's fiercely Protestant writers waged battle not only on Islam, but Catholicism as well, as Francis Rous did in *The Diseases of the Time, Attended by their Remedies* [1620]. "The mayne Body of their Religion is a Body of Sores" wrote Rous of the infectious and harmful dogma of Catholicism which he claimed threatened to "wound" the holy Church of England (Rous 1622: A10). Whether a product of ecclesiastical insurrection, or not, the reality of epidemic was that London's inhabitants were falling victim to a losing battle against plague. The anatomy conveyed that the mortal wounds of outbreak had corporeal and symbolic significance.

If we consider plague as a wounding weapon, as many satyr-anatomists did, plague was most often considered an "arrowe,"[43] or a variation thereof, such as, "Sharpe-pointed Iauelins, Malls, and poisonous darts," for example (A.H. 56).[44] The image of the arrow was a mythological one invoking Homer's "Apollo" from the

---

[42] In *Three Godlie and Frvitful Sermons* [1610], J. Dod compared Londoners to foreign heretics or traitors fighting against the providential will of the almighty, but, as Dod reminded his readers,

> the great King of heauen, who will plague those that are traitors against his Maiestie with al manner of judgements in this life and when he hath done with them here, will call them to a reckoning againe at the great Assises at the last day, and there expose them to perpetuall shame and infamie, and inflict vpon their bodies and soules such torments as shall bee easelesse, endless and remedilesse. (Dod 122-123).

[43] For a small sampling of authors who used the symbolic arrow in the anatomy see: William Cupper's *Certaine Sermons* [1592], 5-6; Nashe's *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem* [1593], *Comp Wks II*: 29; Francis Herring's *A Modest Defence Herring* [1604], A3; John Sanford's *Gods arrowe of the pestilence* [1604], 1; William Warde's *Gods Arrowes* [1607], 1; Thomas Adams' *The divells blanket* [1613], 67; George Wither's *Britain's Remembrancer* [1626], Pt I: 32; William Gouge's *Gods Three Arrowes* [1631]; John Trapp's *Gods Love-Tokens* [1637], 209; and George Thomson's *Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized* [1666], 3.

[44] Even the legitimate anatomist of the Great Plague, George Thomson, used the same metaphor. According to Thomson, "those wounds" in the plague body "are made by its intoxicated arrows" (*LPA* 54).

Iliad.[45] Bedsides the weapons of archery, Francis Herring also argued that "The plague [wa]s called the sword, [or] the hand . . . of God" (Herring 1604: A3). William Bullein preferred the "blacke dart, called the pestilence" (*DFP* 115), whereas Henry Petowe adopted "the heavy dead-striking mace of Plague and Pestilence, that hath euen bruised mee and mine in peeces" (Petowe 2). Amongst the diverse arsenal of Dekker, the pamphleteer also alluded to the "three Rods of Vengeance" (*PPD* 142). But whatever battle implement the satirist appropriated for his anatomy of sores, the infectious weapon was capable of "Mak[ing] Massacres through all the trembling parts" of the sufferer (A.H. 56). The anatomy also asserted, however, that God did not always require weapons to execute his providential wrath because, "the scourging hand of God" was equally proficient at striking tokens upon sinners (*BRII*: 283).

In addition to the symbolic weapons of plague, therefore, we must also consider "the handes of the Plague" (*PPD* 47), or, more specifically, the pestilential digits of "the mightie hand of God" (*SPA* 17). As Robert Horne mentioned in *A Caveat to preuent future Ivdgements* [1626], the satirical anatomy was overtly attentive to "remembering Gods late hand" (Horne 20). A considerable amount of the discourse was, therefore, concerned more with divine hand-to-body combat without weapons. Nicholas Bownd, in *A treatise fvl of Consolation* [1608], noted, for example, how the infected body had to "indure hard things at the hands of God" (Bownd 64). According to Nashe's allegorical *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem* [1593], the tokens themselves resembled hand prints. Nashe expressed that "Hys hand I may well terme it, for on many that are arrested with the Plague is the print of a hand seene, and in the very moment it first takes the [sic], they feeled a sencible blow gyuen them, as it were with the hande of some stander by" (Nashe *Wks II*: 171-72). The "sencible blow" Nashe described was, of course, not the dismissive slap of an open hand, but the divine thwack of the Almighty's clenched fist. Through this array of figurative weapons used to inflict such wounds, as the anatomy communicated, plague sores remained "Gods Tokens," divine signifiers "Of his [God's] feareful Iudgements . . . pronounced vpon this City" (*PPD* 135), a notion that would persist beyond the seventeenth century, to be later rejuvenated by William Boghurst,[46] Daniel Defoe,[47] and even Albert Camus.[48]

---

[45] As Raymond Crawfurd notes of Homer's *Iliad*: "Apollo the Avenger sends the pestilence in punishment of sin. Homer sets it as a signal evidence of divine displeasure in the forefront of his epic, as does Sophocles after him in the greatest of his tragedies . . . Apollo is pictured as the god who spreads the plague by arrows shot from his bow" (Crawfurd 5). See also Raymond Anselment's *The Realms of Apollo: Literature and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England* and Frederick Cartwright's *Disease and History*, 26.

From the wages of war and combat, we must resort back to the wages of sin, because as Thomas Preston reminded his readers, "It is with sinne . . . as it is with a man that hath received his deadly wound from his enemy" (Preston 1635: 12). In the spirit of "Sorenes,'" who asked "Chirugi" in *Bulleins Bulwarke of Defence againste all Sicknesse, Soarnesse, and Woundes* [1562]: "I pray you say som thyng of fylthy ulcers," we shift our attentions away from the allegorical battlefield and into the more pustular and scabrous domain of the taxonomy of sores (*BBD* 10). And although Sir Philip Sidney maintained in *An Apology for Poetrie* [1595] that it was "high and excellent Tragedy, that openeth the greatest wounds, and showeth forth the ulcers that are covered with tissue" (*AAP* 117), the "low realist" dramas of the satirical anatomy were equally adept at exposing an especially aversive classification of providential sores "purloined fro[m] . . . scabbed dispositions, and vlcerous inclinations" (Anton B7).

---

[46] Writing during the Great Plague, the apothecary William Boghurst, still referred to plague sores in *Loimographia: An Account of The Great Plague of 1665* [1665] as "Tokens of God's wrath for sin" (*LGP* 47).

[47] Defoe's fictitious narrator H.F., in *A Journal of the Plague Year* [1722], also complained of Londoners who "blaspheme God, and talk Atheistically; making a Jest at my calling the Plague the Hand of God, mocking and even laughing at the Word Judgment, as if the Providence had no Concern in the inflicting of such a desolating Stroke" (Defoe 66).

[48] In Camus' *The Plague*, Father Paneloux invoked the metaphor of the violent visitation which issued from the hand of God. As Paneloux expressed, God

> loosed on you this visitation; as He has visited all the cities that offended against Him, since the dawn of history. Now you are learning your lesson, the lesson that was learnt by Cain and his offspring, by the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, by Job and Pharaoh, by all that hardened their hearts against Him. And like them you have been beholding mankind and all creation with new eyes, since the gates of this city closed on you and on the pestilence. Now, at last, you know the hour has struck to bend your thoughts to first and last things. (Camus 82)

The satirical, and to a large degree, the medical dissection of plague sores were comprehensive but indelicately berating pursuits. William Bullein's Menippean anatomy, *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578] fashioned the diseased body as a text "Uppon whose Skin is this writyng, hangyng in the judgement Halle before the place of Justice" (*DFP* 84). For Bullein and many others, the anatomy deciphered the sores on the diseased vellum as divine tokens; exemplary wounds inflicted by "thy deuine and vnspotted Maiestie" (*APA* C3) on sufferers for their accursed sins and moral transgressions. Upon this "lamentable defeature of Bodies" (*PPD* 209), the Lord's wrath incised "filthie corruptions and deformities" which "defaced" the plague body (*SPT* 18). The deforming nature of plague was none other than the providential repercussion of "pestilentiall sinnes." The disfiguring inquiry of the anatomy, on the other hand, was a intolerant response to disease and an attack on what the satirist considered to be the social and moral excesses of Renaissance decadence (Guilpin 61). Echoing the sentiments of his satirical contemporaries, George Gascoigne envisioned infection thus:

> Forasmuch as no deformitie, no hurt, no blot, can so much defyle, infect, or disorder mans bodie, and make it seeme so detestable and disfigured in mens eyes, as the reasonable soule is with euerie mortall sinne blemished, made vyle, infected, and made filthie and detestable before the sight of the diuine maiestie and of his holie Angels. (*DOD* F2)

While plague deformed the body, the infection was not driven by some natural or biological agent, but rather, as Gascoigne and the satirist would argue, the vector of "filthie and detestable" sins, metaphysical agents which had both spiritual and corporeal repercussions on the body.

Emulating the zealous timbre of Gascoigne, James Godskall also made the distinction between the physical or "corporall" plague and the more "metaphysical" or providential pestilence in *The kings medicine for this present yeere 1604*, dismissing the former notion as "vulgar" and uniformed.[49] Contradicting John Trapp's conception of plague sores as "Gods Love-Tokens" (Trapp 1), however, Godskall contended the sores and "The disease it selfe," and its ravages were "Deuils tokens," infectious sores more than capable of destroying both body and soul (*TKM* B8). For Godskall, corporeal pain and suffering wasn't the issue; "the Plague of the soule" was much more grievous than the tumoural gnawing of "pestilential Carbuncles" because "infection did manifest it self" predominately on the spiritual body or soul (Ibid. B8). The deformity of the physical and the metaphysical body mirrored the body's misshapen soul. Unlike the gaze of the medical anatomy, Godskall's dissective enterprise intended to expose "the diuers sinnes . . . to bee seene" – the metaphysical signs of infection – not simply the "diuers" sores and discharges that dominated medical discourse (Ibid. D1). Much like John Downame's anatomy, therefore, Godskall's satirical gaze fell under the rubric "Spiritual physicke to cure the diseases of the soule" (*SPT* I). Although "The Signes of the corporall [we]re more palpable, then of the sprirituall sickenesse," as Thomas Adams noted, sores were body's suppurating windows of the corrupt and putrefying soul (*DOS* 58). The "Pestilences of the soule," therefore, eclipsed any and all of the physical discomforts and deformities generated in the physical body by the "corporall" plague (*BRI* 218).

But what of the difference between "corporall Plague" (*TKM* D1) and the symbolic realm? In all fairness, on a literal or visual level, the erupting surface of the infected body must have been an unpleasant and intimidating sight at best. By most satirical accounts, plague's essential malignancy produced corporeal signs of disgust, reducing the body to a macabre reminder of sinful mortality. To put the symptoms in perspective, Paul Slack offers a succinct overview of the "token'd" body. According to Slack:

---

[49] As Godskall argued, "sores of the corporall Plague are called by the vulgar (Gods-tokens)" (*TKM* D1).

> The clinical symptoms of the disease are as striking as the speed with which it develops. Cells are rapidly destroyed and nervous tissues inflamed. The victim's temperature rises, to around 40°C, and he suffers headaches, vomiting, pain and delirium before sinking into a final coma. At the same time the unmistakable signs of the disease appear on the skin. A blister forms at the site of the original flea-bite and develops into a gangrenous blackish carbuncle. The lymph nodes, usually in the groin but sometimes in the armpit or neck, swell and suppurate, forming the buboes which give *bubonic plague* its name. Finally fresh carbuncles appear, along with blisters and large subcutaneous spots which can change colour between orange and black, blue and purple. These spots were described by historical observers as the 'tokens' of plague, and they and the other clinical manifestations made cases of bubonic plague easily recognisable. (Slack 1992: 8)

Unlike the dissective cataloguing of the satirist, Slack's taxonomy is, of course, rational and restrained.[50] Pragmatism was not, however, always the guiding method of the satyr-anatomist or physician within the anatomy. Contrary to the legitimate anatomist, the satirist sought more metaphysical meanings of infection. By explaining the hurtful nature of the disease largely through the divine violence of biblical allegory, the satirist argued that the sensory pangs of infection were providentially driven: metaphysical pains of infection upon "limbes of Flesh that brooke this agony" (*HH* 158).

---

[50] In *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater: The Stuart Years,* Leeds Barroll offers a similar taxonomy: According to Barroll:

> The swelling over the lymph gland today called a bubo was then called a plague sore or a botch, while the individual poxlike irruptions often covering the body affected by general plague were known as blains. The carbuncles, which may also accompany plague, becoming sometimes an inch in diameter, were then also referred to as carbuncles. These were quite painful and, in fact, the excruciating pain of plague was understood by physicians of the time as coming not from the rupturing of the bubo but from the unbearable burning of these carbuncles. Last, to conclude this rather sordid inventory, were the small, measlelike discolorations then known as tokens. (Barroll 80)

The distress and torment of infection was, without question, an essential part of the taxonomy of sores and its ancillary pains. As the satirist anatomised and reviled the sufferer, he claimed to have exposed the essence of the body's physical and metaphysical soreness. A sore body – the anatomy argued – meant a tortured soul. This anatomical predicate was, of course, built on what Michel Foucault describes as a "fantasy link between knowledge and pain" (Foucault *Birth of*: xi), an assumption that the pain of sickness offered some kind of revelatory providence, as Donne intimated in *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*,[51] reflecting upon his own battle with fevered sickness. To convey the insightful wisdom of pain, William Bullein, in *Bulleins Bulwarke of Defence* [1562], for example, thought it fit to personify pain in the form of his Menippean character, "Soarenes." Imbued with character and speech, "Soarnes" was, according to Bullein, "sore in body" and he bore a painful message –"a fearful Tragidye . . . from the mouth of God" – a cautionary warning about sins that harm the flesh and pain the soul (*BBD* 2).

---

[51] In "Devotion VII" *From Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*, Donne put his own sickness within the daunting perspective of epidemic. As Donne wrote:

> How many are sicker (perchance) than I, and laid on their wofull straw at home (if that corner be a home) and have no more hope of helpe, though they die, than of preferment, though they live? Nor doe no more expect to see a phisician then, than to be an Officer after; of whome, the first that takes knowledge, is the Sexten that buries them; who buries them in oblivion too? for they doe but fill up the number of the dead in the Bill, but we shall never heare their Names, till wee reade them in the Booke of life, with our owne. How many are sicker (perchance) than I, and thrown into Hospitals, where (as a fish left upon the Sand, must stay the tide) they must stay the Phisicians houre of visiting, and then can bee but visited? How many are sicker (perchaunce) than all we, and have not this Hospitall to cover them, not this straw, to lie in, to die in, but have their Grave-stone under them, and breathe out their soules in the eares, and in the eies of passengers, harder than their bed, the flint of the street? That taste of no part of our Phisick, but a sparing dyet; to whom ordinary porridge would bee Julip enough, the refuse of our servants, Bezar enough, and the off-scouring of our Kitchen tables, Cordiall enough. O my soule, when thou art not enough awake, to blesse thy God enough for his plentifull mercy, in affoording thee many Helpers, remember how many lacke them, and helpe them to them, or to those other things, which they lack as much as them. (Donne *Devotions*, 49-50)

In the narrative spirit of Bullein's "Soarnes," John Godskall explained most succinctly the divine force of the plague sore in *The Arke of Noah* [1604]. Godskall argued:

> So the Lord to beate downe the pride and immoderate ioy of our Citie, the flourishing Gourd of our presperitie, hath not sent whole armies, deuouring beasts, Earthquakes, fire or brimstone from heauen, he sendeth only a pestilence, litle Carbuncles, spots, and tokens in our flesh, which seeme to bee nothing, or to haue no force, and yet suddainly beate downe the proudest and the strongest. Ist not strange that a little botch or carbuncle hath such admirable force? Well may they be called Gods tokens, for thereby he sheweth his strength. (*AON* C1)

Godskall's anatomy contended that whatever wrathful weapon the Lord wielded upon London, the "sore" wound, though often small, nevertheless, had an "admirable," and an ultimately, destructive "force" that roused mortality. Small or large, the plague sore had magnanimous implications.

Whether bubo, boil or blain, or even "bubukle," as Shakespeare's "Fluellen" in *Henry V* [1599] mistakenly referred to such sores (*H5 III* vi 108),[52] God's tokens were considered providential contusions, inflicted directly or indirectly by "the hande of God" (*TKM* G4). Depending upon the dogmatic pretensions of the satirist, sufferers were likened to the biblical Job,[53] Hezekiah,[54] Lazarus,[55] David,[56] plague-stricken Israelites,[57] or even a derivative form of the Lutherean Mönchskalb.[58] The "ghastly vizages" (*DPP* 26) of these willing and deserving victims of plague were most often placed into a variety of allegorical settings which transformed London into hell,[59] the valley of the shadow of death,[60] a veritable Golgotha,[61] or ground-zero of the Apocalypse.[62] As the anatomy expressed, Londoners incited divine violence for ignoring the laws of God. Consequently, "The hand of vengeance f[e]ll in rage," wrote Dekker in *Newes from Graues-Ende* [1604], often "Striking the sinfull body dead" at that (*PPD* 92). Like an embattled abattoir, "the Slaughter-house of Death" (*BRI* 33) was a grievously sore city where sufferers languished in "The bodily paine that pursues sicknes," until most perished in pain (*ES* 89).

---

[52] In his confusion, the Welsh Captain Fluellen created a darkly funny neologistical sore.

---

[53] Many authors allude to Job in the anatomy. Thomas Dekker's *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603] is indicative of the popular allusion. Dekker addressed sufferers who "haue lyen fuller of byles & plague-sores than euer did Iob" (*PPD* 36). See also William Cupper's *Certaine Sermons Concerning Gods Late visitation* [1592], 6; Richard Greenham's *A most Sweete and assured Comfort for all those in Conscience, or troubled in mind* [1595], G8-G9; Samuel Rowlands' *A Terrible Battell betweene the two consumers of the whole World: Time, and Death* [1606] D2, M.M.'s *An Ease for a diseased Man* [1625], A7; and Thomas Swadling's *Sermons, Meditations, and Prayers, upon the Plague* [1636], 63.

[54] In *An Epistle Discovrsing vpon the present Pestilence* [1603], Henoch Clapham spoke of "Hezekiah (howsoeuer hauing promise of recouerie) did meane time suffer a lumpe . . ." (Clapham 1603: B2). See also Robert Harris' *Hezekiah's Recovery* [1626].

[55] Dekker wrote, in *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603]: "Lazarus laie groning at euery mans doore" (*PPD* 33) to describe the grievous social conditions of mass mortality.

[56] Among many other notable writers, Robert Burton and Aemelia Lanyer also allude to the plagues of David, (*AM* Pt I Sec I 135 & Lanyer 70) the punishment chosen for numbering his people. Sampson Price's *Londons Remembrancer: For the Staying of the Contagiovs Sicknes of the Plagve: By Dauids Memoriall* [1626] is, however, specifically modelled on allegorical interpretation of the plagues of David in an early modern context.

[57] Nashe's *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem* [1593] likens ancient Jerusalem under the siege of plague to London's plague of 1593. Thomas Adams allegorical work, *Englands Sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels* [1615], is made self-evident in its title.

[58] According to Geoffrey Harpham, the "Mönchskalb" was the "terribly deformed man" Luther fashioned as an "allegorical witness of the 'signs of the times'." See Harpham's *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature*, 21.

[59] In *Newes from Graues-ende* [1604], Dekker equated "The Horror of a Plague, with "Hell" (*PPD* 82) and in *Dekker his Dreame* [1620], he also descended into the "Darknesse of Hell: Black, Stinking, Stiffling, Poysoning, and Eternall" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks III*: 40). Samuel Rowlands similarly offered an infernal London environs in *Hell's broke loose* [1605].

[60] William Crashawe, in *Londons Lamentation for her Sinnes* [1625], likened London to the scriptural setting of the 23rd Psalm. According to the Puritan divine, negotiating the mortality of London was like walking "hourely through the valley of the shadow of Death," where Crashawe had to "bury[ ] forty, fifty, sometimes sixty a day" (Crashawe 156).

[61] For John Taylor the Water-Poet, London was Golgotha, the macabre site of Christ's crucifixion where "greiued London, fill'd with mones and grones / Is like a Golgotha, of dead mens bones" (Taylor 1625: B1).

[62] In *Salomons Pest-Hovse* [1630], J.D. alludes to *Revelations*: "Yea, the black Horse of the Pestilence with pale Death on his backe, hath beene and is, eft-soones, prauncing and trampling in the streets of our Citie at midnight" (J.D. A3). John Godskall's *The Arke of Noah* [1604], also points to *Revelations*: "the Pestilence, the Kind of heauens Pursiphant; and therefore wee may crie with the Angels, Apoc. 14. With a lowde voice, feare God, and fiue glorie to him, for the houre of his iudgement is come" (*AON* C1).

In addition to the interior pangs of "the pricke of concience, and the sting of corruption" (Anatomy E8), the infected sufferer had to contend "with a great burning and pricking pain" from the "diuers Pustules" which manifested on the body surface (*ADP* 35). For those "sore in body," it was the "broken issue of the skinne," (C.G. B4) as *The Minte of Deformities* [1600] articulated, that opened, the "greatest wounds" imaginable because these ulcerous and dehiscent plague tokens oozed with the wages of sin (*AAP* 117). In the anatomy, sins and sores were synonymous. Moreover, plague sores, added Bullein, "doe excell more in payne and be farre crueller" than sores with less providential significance (*BBD* 10). Plague sores were "universally painful" because they were the product of universal sins. Henry Holland had commented in *Spiritvall Preseruatiues against the Pestilence* [1603] that "The Pestilence is here saide to bee noisome, greiuous, and painefull," and by all medical and satirical accounts, plague was that and more (*SPA* B30).

Following the initial violence of God's stroke, "the sore bodie infected" (*DFP* 46) commenced its metamorphosis. "The euill, dangerous, and morall signes" that the physician Thomas Lodge observed began to manifest on the skin (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 21). "After or with this Pestilence," wrote William Bullein of the infectious process, "there wil a feareful sore appere, as we haue the knowledge vniuersall by painfull experience, which we dooe call the plague sore" (*DFP* 44). Soon, "Scabs, and biles, and running sores appeare[d]," remarked Wither, who claimed to observe God's bruises transforming into gangrenised "festring sore[s]" (*BRII*: 518 & *BRI*: 122) of cankers and carbuncles, discharging their "runnyng matter" (*DFP* 47). These were the "scars and blains of outward infamy" (*BRII:* 518) stigmatically engraved upon the "weeping and forlorne" plague body (Milton D2).

The taxonomy of bodily eruptions consisted predominately of botches or buboes, carbuncles, blains, and spots known collectively as "Gods-Tokens." As the plague body metamorphosed into a cascade of "evill coloured Spots, Pustles, Blisters, Swellings; and Vlcers full of filthy matter," these corporeal sores had a much more profound symbolic meaning than the inflammatory status of the physical body might otherwise suggest (*WMP* 43). The painful swellings of pestilence were also, argued John Preston, "inward Ulcers of the soule" that "pierce us more than any outward grievance whatsoever, that can assault the body" (Preston 1635: 215). Like his contemporaries, Thomas Swadling maintained that the plague was the result of sin penetrating the soul before erupting its corruption within and eventually outside of the body. Swadling envisioned plague in *Sermons, Meditations, and Prayers, upon the Plague* [1636] thus:

> The plague is *Tumor in corpore*, and so pride is *Tumor inmente*; That a sweling in the body, this in the soule. If the plague be exalted, and becomes *Macula incorpore*, Tokens in the body, then the body dyes: so if pride be exalted, and become *Macula in anima*, Spots in the soule, then the soule dyes. (Swadling 68)

Swadling's either/or scheme of infection was a grim one at best: either the corporeal body died from infection or the soul perished from the dreaded "spots" of corruption. The infectious corruption that converged upon the body was catalogued not only by Swadling but by many satyr-anatomists in various measures.

Within the taxonomical realm of the anatomy, plague sores erupted in a variety of sizes. Sores were not only excessively painful, but they could also distend inordinately. Two somewhat suspect accounts concerning sores of considerable girth and amplitude, come from two very different writers: the comedic-spirited

Dekker and staunchly Calvinist Henoch Clapham. In Dekker's *The Ravens Almanacke* [1604], for example, an afflicted character complained of an over-sized token: "I haue a Plague sore vppon mee (your Doctors Cap is not able to couer it, tis so broad) it eates and spreds more and more into my flesh" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks IV*: 200). The substantial token in Dekker's story is humorous yet disturbingly parasitical, as it is in the process of quite literally devouring the sufferer's body. In a more Swetnamesque and unhumored departure from Dekker, Clapham's pamphlet, *His Demaundes and Answeres touching the Pestilence* [1604], described a hefty sized "plague sore, within a spanne of a womans dugge" (Clapham 1604: E2). While John Davies spoke of how plague "Beblaine[d] the bosome," he was not using the "spanne" of a "dugge" as his scale of measurement (*TD* 227). Clapham's gauge of comparison, of course, embodied a symbolic inference: a breast-like sore transforming into the nurturing teat of plague. Lactation is equated with suppuration, as the infected organ secreted not milk, but contaminating pus, which would likely nourish and sustain epidemic. In all fairness to the anatomy, however, Henoch's misogynist analogy was a freakish extreme, but an important one to note, nevertheless.

For a more balanced view of the taxonomy of sores, medical discourse provides the best comparative standard with which to gauge the distortion and exaggeration of the satirical anatomy. In contrast to the two previous examples, it is worth exploring at least two more empirical anatomies recorded by early modern physicians. Though personal accounts are few and far between, two self-anatomies of infection bear mentioning -- one from a quack physician and astrologer, and the other – a legitimate anatomist.

During the epidemic of 1592-1593, the physician/astrologer, Simon Forman, came down with plague symptoms in June of 1592 after a trip to "Ypswitch" and described them in his *Diary* thus:

> the 21. dai I begane to complaine in my groine, and the 6. of Julii I toke my bed and had the plague in both my groines, and som moneth after I had the red tokens on my feet as brod as half pence and yt was 22 wickes before I was well again, the which did hinder me moch. (Forman 22)

Ridden with buboes and botches, the self-suffering Forman's tempered narrative is exceptional for the period because it is devoid of the emotional and hyperbolic language employed by most satirical writers describing the slings and arrowes of outrageous infection. His five-and-a-half month bout with plague must have been an exceptional ordeal, yet he understated its impact by reducing the experience to a fatiguing hinderance. Forman's rather litotal account appropriately counterbalanced the histrionic fervour of the anatomy, because few writers shared Forman's utter lack of overstatement.

The other self-anatomist, George Thomson, M.D. and author of ***Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized.*** [1666], knew plague sores intimately because he had experienced tokens and buboes firsthand: an anatomist skilled at, as he explained, "opening their Bubo's, and cutting out Eschars of Carbuncles, by the operation of my own hand" (*LPA* 109). Thomson not only survived three bouts of infection, he was also the first English physician to dissect a plague body without the "Dogmatical Fancy" of the satirist, despite the fact that the tenor of his discourse, like most of his medical contemporaries, remains morally charged (Ibid. 4).[63] What is unique about Thomson's self-anatomy, however, is its unintentionally Rabelaisian spirit. Describing a gargantuan-sized eruption in an awkwardly placed location, Thomson explained his disconcerting affliction rather empirically. "The Fundament, where [there] appeared in some few dayes a very great Bubo of the bigness of a Tennis-ball," explained Thomson, "quite stopp[ed] up the passage of the Anus" (Ibid. 91). Unlike the healthy excremental body of the anatomy, the plague body, as Thomson elucidated from personal experience, was, if anything, anal retentive. Had this been Dekker's anatomy, Dekker would have, of course, spun a humorous yarn from Thomson's constipatory anecdote.[64] But where "mirth [wa]s both *Phisicall*, and wholesome against the *Plague*" for Dekker, the medical treatment of plague -- for Thomson and the licensed physician -- was no laughing matter (*PPD* 3). Again, the pronounced lack of humour in the discourse did not necessarily mean that the anatomy could not be colourful.

---

[63] The rather forthright doctor maintained that "The Substance of this Discourse is Practical, no idle Dogmatical Fancy of a Non Ens, No Necessary Directions from Hearsaid" (*LPA* 4), however, his anatomical lexicon remains morally loaded and suspiciously condemning. See Thomson's ***Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized***, 8, 9, 34, 39, 91, 105 & 109,

Besides the disfiguring eruptions, the deformed surface also transmogrified in hue -- almost becoming chameleon-like at times -- with its suppurating botches "of divers colours like the raynbow round about [them]," if Simon Kellwaye's explanation was accurate (*ADP* 16). Commenting on the tincture of the token, Stephen Bradwell's observation ratified the spectral qualities of Kellwaye's diagnosis. According to Bradwell, "In colour they are for the most part of a pale blew, but somtimes also purple or blackish, circled with a reddish circle" (*WMP* 51). In *A new treatise of the pestilence* [1603], S.H., for example, mentioned the immanent dangers of "a darke greene or euill coloured sore" (S.H. A4). For Kellwaye, however, the carbuncle remained the most colourful affliction. When the "carbunckle . . . doth shew to be of a wannish blew colour," wrote Kellwaye, it "is a deadly signe, [and] if the skinne appeare greene or blacke spottes the excrements of dyvers colours with wormes in it, either dead or liuing, hauing a uile stinking sauour, and spitteth stinking and bloudy matter, both betoken death" (*ADP* 16). Waivering between the quick and the dead, the variegated flesh of the infected sufferer signified advancing mortality: a *memento mori* pigment of "blewish or leaden colour" (*WMP* 51).

---

[64] Rick Bowers explores the comic "therapy" of Dekker's pathological ruminations in *The Wonderfull Yeare*. As Bowers points out, what set Dekker apart from his contemporaries is that Dekker had the unique ability to transform horror into humour; the talent to generate laughter out of the macabre reality of epidemic. Knowing Dekker's appetite for grotesque merriment, the plague pamphleteer could have undoubtedly produced a most humorous anecdote from Thomson's bubo-blocked fundament. See Bowers' essay "Antidote to the Plague: Thomas Dekker's Story-Telling in *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603]" in *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature*, 229-239.

As Kellwaye, Bradwell and Thomson elaborated in their taxonomies, the colour spectrum of infection was predominately "beset with spots black and blew" (*LPA* 72). Although black had been the traditional colour of death and pestilence -- a notion inherited from the "Black Death" of 1348 -- blue embodied an ominously mortal tinge of its own. Blue was, for the early moderns, the "colour of plagues and things hurtful."[65] But it wasn't just the physician who drew the associations between the infectious contusions and encroaching death. In *The Meeting of Gallants at an Ordinarie* [1604], for example, Dekker spoke of bodies "Full of blew wounds" (*PPD* 109). Similarly, Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* [1589], also alluded to the perils of what Henry Petowe called "The blew blacke drops thereof sprinkled on the bodyies" (Petowe 11). In Spenser's words -- "Full of diseases was his carcas blew" -- blue not only captured the melancholia of disease but the azure depths of what were assumed to be divinely mortal contusions (*FQ* I iv 23.6).

While blue was hurtful to the body, black tokens on the body signified mortality. During the pangs of death, the blue tokens typically began to blacken. Even for the legitimate anatomist, the darkened tokens were considered stigmatic marks of sin and death. "Those *stigmata nigra*, they call the Tokens, in the superficies of the Skin," explained the anatomist George Thomson, were the empirical proof, "that this or that Person dyed of the Sicknes" (*LPA* 47). For sick bodies, therefore, black was the ominous colour of impending death in the quick body and the colour of post-infection rigor mortis in the dead body. As the anatomy elucidated, the united colours of pestilence had profound significance for the array of sores which erupted on the body surface.

---

[65] See *OED* Vol II.

Having anatomised the sores in size and in hue, a brief cataloguing of sores will provide closure to the taxonomy of "pestiferous vlcers, or pestilential carbuncles or biles, scabs and sores most noysome" (*SPA* 34). Although Nicholas Bownd euphemised the sores as that which "the Lord puts thornes and bryars as it were in our waies, that is laieth affliction against vs," few satirical writers were at a loss when it came to articulating the grotesque nature of the runny pustules of infection (Bownd 78). In keeping with the Neoplatonic conventions of the anatomy, the cankered body mirrored the "cankered world" (Norden iv) -- a body riddled with sores which indelibly marked the sufferer with -- "Punctilios, Pulicar-like Spots, those Stigmatick marks on the Skin" (*LPA* 110). With its array of external sores, or "diuers pestilentiall vlcers" then, the "token'd" plague body was symbolically dissected into a bizarre and frighteningly didactic construct (*TKM* D1).

Dekker, Holland, Godskall and most of their satirical contemporaries demonstrated that the expressed purpose of the satirical dissections was to expose the immaculate violence that left maculate strokes upon the body. This was "the token'd pestilence, where death is sure" that Scarus noted in *Antony and Cleopatra* [1607], conveying a popular Elizabethan notion (*ANT* III x 9). Within the anatomy, "Tokens" were the cankered eruptions known as "the polluted spots of synne" (Downame 1) or "leaprous spots" that often covered the whole body (*PPD* 85). Although the multi-coloured tokens ranging in hues from red to blue, and black to dusky brown, tokens were the least dangerous sores. Nevertheless, tokens remained the "forerunners of death" (Bell 127). "The Tokens are Spots of the bignesse of Flea bitings, some bigger, some as bigge as a penny," observed Bradwell, "They shew themselues commonly in the brest and backe; but they will sometimes appeare in other places also. In some they will be many, in some but a few, in others but one or two" (*WMP* 51). Unfortunately, Bradwell's visionary gaze did not make the connection between the "Flea bitings" and infection, though his diagnosis bordered, for the most part, on the empirical.

"Procuring exceeding paine," as Thomas Lodge explained, buboes or botches as they were also known, were inflamed swellings that appeared primarily in the neck and groin (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 72). They were tumourous swellings that erupted over the lymph glands which drained the infected area of the body. Buboes appeared in the nearest place where the fleabite injected the plague bacillus. Botches could erupt, therefore, in the neck and groin or under the arms. According to Bradwell's description,

> The Botch is a hard swelling, rising as I sayd before in the necke, vnder the eares, or vnder the chinne; and in the armepits; & in the groynes. It swelleth somtimes no bigger then a Nutmeg; somtimes as bigge as a Wall-nut; others as a Hens egge, and some as bigge as a Mans fist. Also some it swelleth out very fully to be seene plainly, and becommeth so soare that it can endure nothing to touch it; in others it lieth low and deepe in the flesh, onely to be found by feeling; and somtimes also scarcely to be felt; but if you touch the place, it is painfull. Those that lie high and plaine to be seene, are more hopefull; the low lurking ones are very ominous and pernicious. (*WMP* 51)

These painful sores or "filthy Botch[es]," were not simply sores, but rather, the sinful manifestations penetrating the body envelope, erupting in a variety of sizes, and, as Bradwell articulated, in awkward places (*TKM* D4). To this end, Bradwell's repression and euphemism is quite illuminating, as the sores become lurking tokens corrupting the body's unmentionable areas: the "low lurking" and "ominous and pernicious" areas around the naughty bits. John Gerard also shared Bradwell's anxiety of infection. In *The herbal* [1597], for example, Gerard referred to the "impostume . . . called a Bubo by reason of his lurking in such secret places" (Gerard cxxxiii). Other satirists would draw repressive comparisons between sex and botches as well. Even the "Chapleine of Magdalen Colledge" in Oxford, John Sanford, spoke of "loynes . . . filled with filthy and abominable corruption" (Sanford 16), as did John Davies' *The Triumph of Death* [1605] mention "loines, / With plagues, strike through Extortions loathed," that "riuet in them glowing pestilence" (*TD* 225). In defense of the satirist, however, there was something suspiciously lewd about a disease that could strike so near the nether regions.

Like the botch, "the carbunkle or blaine," was another most painful eruption "with a great burning and pricking pain" (*ADP* 35). Depending on its malignant qualities, the carbuncle could also, argued Simon Kellwaye, "betoken death" (Ibid. 16). Known for his cynicism and sarcasm, John Davies, in *Microcosmos* [1603], likened the "Carcanet of glorious Carbuncle" to suppurating jewellery (*MC* 234). For the anatomist, however, the carbuncle was more about pain than appearance, however. As Bradwell commented, "it is strange to see that so small a tumor should be so devilish and dangerous to life; for if it be not with great care, and exceeding good meanes attended, it bringeth speedy death" (*WMP* 51-2). Beyond its appearance, however, the carbuncle was, according to Bradwell's description, "wonderfull angry, and furiously enflaming, as if a quicke coale of fire were held to the place: when it hath his name Carbunculus, a little coal of fire" (*WMP* 51). The carbuncle or blain, also had a sinister nature. Like the bubo,

> It creepeth secretly in the flesh next vnder the skin, and is full of such a furious malignant poyson, as it will quickly consume and eate out so great a

> peece of flesh (for the capacitie it is in) as a man would wonder how it could so suddainly be done: being as if one did burne a hole with a hot iron. (Ibid. 51-52)

Though a poxlike eruption (Barroll 80), the blain was equally layered with scriptural meaning. Like the plague of boils and blains in Exodus 9:9: "And it shall become dust in all the land of Egypt, and shall be a boil breaking forth with blains upon man," the blain was as divinely wrought as any of God's tokens. Such was the fallen state of the sufferer's "tainted flesh" (*BRI* 140) "most peppered with the disease" in this grotesque taxonomy (*LGP* 42).

As this section has argued, the discursive gaze of anatomy mapped the visible geography of the plague body. Although the anatomist invoked the "Most ugsome shapes" and metamorphosing physical guises of the infected body, many of the dissective observations were more concerned with the metaphysical or symbolic status of the body than its corporeal nature (Hake E5). By exploiting the body's disfigured fabric as his starting point, the satirist's discursive regime dissected and denounced a hybrid body of sin and sores wounded by providential wrath. Within the taxonomy of sores, the satyr-anatomist cast aspersions upon the sufferer and made moral judgements based on religious and cultural assumptions of the biblically-charged sores. It was through this ritual dehumanizing of plague victims that London's satirical anatomists made their invective dissections most caustic. As Dekker concluded – "God will not haue his Strokes hidden: his markes must be seene" – the anatomy was all about the exposure and humiliation of a common enemy: the sore-broken sufferer (*PPD* 151). Although the satirist despised the deformed appearance of the grotesque sufferer, what was most loathsome about the infected body was its powers to contaminate. Suffering plague also meant suppurating plague. Hence, where there were plague sores, there was inevitably discharge, yet another "sore" point of the anatomy.

Pestilential Emissions: Discharging Infection

In keeping with the grotesque methods of the satirical anatomy, the satirist was regularly drawn to purulent matter, as the previous chapters have argued. Of all bodies in the history of English literature, perhaps only the leprous body matched the grotesque festerings and the contaminating discharges of the plague body. Indeed, it was the deformed fabric and the volcanic nature of the erupting body that inspired the satirical imaginations to explore the viscous hazards of "the infinite malady" known as the pestilence (*TIM* III vi 97-98). It was the flowing suppuration of the plague body that enabled the satirist to exploit the aberrant possibilities of "the manifold Conflicts, Tumults, Broils, and Uproars in the Body Natural" (*LPA* 44) interior "conflicts" that violently exited the infected body at some fissured opening of its "sores new burst" (Taylor 1625: A6).

Anatomising bodily discharge was not entirely the radical invention we might imagine, however. By 1625, for example, James Hart had anatomised urine and published his findings in *The anatomie of Urine*. Some thirty years later Thomas Brian's popular book called *The pisse-pot Prophet* shed new light on the art of water-casting. "Water-casting was inevitably a major occupation of the physician" (Copeman 118), just as some of the "marvels in each Vrinall" preoccupied the satyr-anatomist (Hall *Coll Poems*: 27). But what was uniquely original about the satirical anatomy of pesilential infection were the ends to which bodily discharge was used. Unlike the medical writers who had honest intentions of promoting understanding and good health, the satirist exploited the aversive qualities of pestilential discharge to bolster disgust for the sufferer. Satiric disgust for the plague victim was founded largely upon what were considered the highly toxic and contaminating powers of plague-related bodily effluents.[66] These viscous liquids were not merely vomit, spit, urine and excrement that a healthy body might evacuate, but rather, these were dangerous and threatening pestilential fluids capable of spreading infection through tactile or miasmatic transmission.

The visceral, and in all fairness, repugnant nature of the illness – considering the aversive textures and odours produced by bubonic, pneumonic, or septacaemic plague – made the infected body ideal dissective matter for the moralising satirist. Because pus, mucous, vomit and blood elicited what William Miller describes as "core disgust" – that innate sense of loathing towards viscous bodily discharges – the satirist bolstered his cautionary moralisings through the aversive nature of his revolting subject matter (Miller *Anatomy*: 6). Plague, he argued, was a grotesque disease induced by grotesque sins and expelled through repellent and contaminating discharges. The slimy and miasmic matter that escaped the infected body was disgusting because the sins that produced it within the body were disgusting and shameful.

What definitively separated medical anatomy from the satirical anatomy was the shaming nature of the latter. Unlike the physician's aims, the satirist's goal was not to treat the disease through "physicke." The satirical intention was to eliminate plague by improving the inferior moral code of London. This methodical plan for social transformation began with the humiliation of the sufferer. By blaming the infected body for its own undoing, the satirical anatomy engendered the shame of infection; expressing moral outrage rather than empirical observations. Of course, a great part of the physical shame of infection was the inability to control bodily discharge. Sharing in the shame of the sufferer was, of course, intended to disgust the reader. William Miller, for example, suggests this shame became internalized by the reader's own disgust and contempt for the sufferer (Miller *Humiliation*: 196). In probing the plague body, the satirist was simultaneously probing the depths of disgust. Somewhat like physicians, therefore, the satirists also expressed concern when the contaminating bodily contents exited the infected body. By appropriating medical discourse to reinforce their grotesque musings and capitalising on the fear and loathing of the plague body, the satyr-anatomist reduced the infected sufferer to a carcass of disgust -- a discharging cadaver -- a degenerate body symbolising degenerate times.

---

[66] As William Miller notes, "Disgust is bound to metaphors of sensation or it is not disgust; it needs images of bad taste, foul smells, creepy touchings, ugly sights, bodily secretions and excretions to articulate the judgments it asserts" (Miller 1997: 218).

Though perhaps grounded in reality, satirical observations were used for moral reform, not for the empirical ends of natural philosophy, however. Intentions aside, with respect to plague emissions, satire and medicine were strangely consolidated. The reductionist fervour of satirical and legitimate anatomy was particularly unyielding as the satyr-anatomist reduced the infected body to little more than a dissected specimen -- a cursory collection of infectious discharges, stenches and sores -- a grotesque body with its "eares" even "runnyng" (*DFP* 132). As Robert R. Wilson explains, through the excess of "Pus . . . the body itself transformed by infection, flowing in thick ooze" (Wilson 16). Dissecting this mass of infection was a precariously abject task, but a necessary venture for the satirist. And whether symbolic pus or laudable pus, both discursive and physical discharges incited revulsion.[67] Despite the satirical excesses into disgust, however, contemporary medical discourse regarding the colour and tactile qualities of pus,[68] for example, lent further credence to the satirical anatomy by supporting the notion of a repellent body made more contemptible through its fetid suppuration.

---

[67] While suppuration posed a contaminating threat to the healthy, the discharge of pus was, nevertheless, considered a positive medical sign because the body was erupting some of its most toxic matter. See A.W. Sloan's ***English Medicine in the Seventeenth Century***, 153.

By fusing the symbolic with the real, the satirical anatomy transformed the unpleasant plague body of the medical gaze into the disgustingly and terrifying mutant of the symbolic realm, as William Cupper had done in *Certaine Sermons Concerning Gods Late visitation* [1592]. In this tract, Cupper concluded that infection embodied and transcended the corporeal: "we are subiect to the murren, pestilence, & infection," said Cupper, "both of bodie and soule" (*CSC* 160). Yet, as he discursively gazed upon, touched and inhaled the mass of discharging matter, the satirist regularly brought the symbolic body back within the corporeal realm of grotesque realism in a cunningly mimetic fashion. Taking full advantage of plague's essential malignancy, the satirist imposed a repulsive corporeality on the infected body of his dissective fictions. Appropriating the disgust of pestilential infection, the discharging symbolic body of the anatomy became more vividly tangible as it became more repulsive.

Transcending decorum, then, satirical writers anatomised and reconstructed a wretched infected body which persistently evacuated its haemorrhagic contents through a variety of bodily openings. "In odour and in hue," the satyr-anatomists descended into the unsophisticated realm of disgust to convey their embellished insights and observations (*SON* 98). To their credit, however, early modern satirists only anatomised "the abiect scumme" of pus (Nashe *Wks III*: 28), they didn't drink it like the infamous, but well-meaning Catherine of Siena [c. 1370] did.[69] Indeed, "it [wa]s the custome of the flye," not the satirist, wrote Stephen Gosson, "to suck at the Botch" (Gosson A2). Because the professed risks of contact with the infected and the disgust of infection, satirists kept their eyes – not their mouths – on virulent sores and discharges.

---

[68] As Nancy Siraisi notes, the texture and colour of pus was an important medical indicator of mortality and survival. According to Siraisi,

> A measure of suppuration was taken for granted as a normal stage in the healing of wounds; surgeons appear to have learned to distinguish between thick white pus, often indicative of an infection that would either heal or form a local abscess, and watery, fetid pus, indicative of a type of infection likely to be followed by gangrene and death. The formation of pus of the first type was therefore considered a desirable development — hence the later expression 'laudable pus'. (Siraisi 169)

Despite the risks and often at his own peril, then, the satyr-anatomist dissected a dangerous body submerged in "infectious poison" (*SPA* 19). "The poyson of this Lingering infection" or infectious discharge, as Dekker suggested, threatened contamination and contagion (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks IV*: 95). Within the anatomy, the plague body was represented as a fetid landscape, a grotesque carnal topography with an array of running protuberances from which, "filthy matter arise[d] in the outward parts of the body" (*WMP* 43). It was beneath this inconstant surface that the corrupt flesh discharged its contaminating fluids. The "malignant alteration" (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 19) of the plague body, according to Thomas Lodge, forced the body to suppurate what George Wither referred to as the "Polluted acts which from that ulcer flowes" (*BRII*: 565).

John Davies of Hereford and most other satirists agreed that plague bodies could "with mortal Sores infect" (*MC* 107) all those who come within the proximity of the diseased,[70] because "their Bodies," discharged, "infectious steams and vapours" (*ABT* 35). While the satirists used descriptive moralising discourse to characterize the "euil, malignant, venemous, or vitious" nature of infection, the legitimate anatomists did not deviate drastically from the satirical model (Lodge *Comp Wks*: 12). Indeed, the satirical repugnance to the infected body was frequently substantiated by medical writers debating the nature of the discharged "filthy matter" (*WMP* 43) and the "spume or froth issuing out thereof" (*ADP* 16).

---

[69] Robert Wilson was the first to inform me of Catherine's disgusting approach to healing. Catherine, as Wilson explained, believed that by drinking the discharging pus of a sufferer, she could eliminate the affliction. In *The Anatomy of Disgust*, William Miller also recounts that Catherine took pleasure in ingesting the suppuration of a cancerous tumour. See William Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust*, 158-62. See also Nancy Siraisi's vivid account of Catherine's sanctimonious pus drinking in *Medieval & Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice*, 46.

[70] Plague was still a divine disease, as the satirists would argue. With regard to pestilential discharge, however, the contaminating discharge was a byproduct of secondary causes. Along with the direct wrath of divine transmission, the disease could also be contracted through association with an infected sufferer.

In spite of their more objective notions of contagion, the discursive empiricism of Stephen Bradwell and George Thomson remained loaded with images of disgust and moral contamination. Bradwell's quasi-scientific *Watch-man for the Pest* [1625], for example, articulated that "the Seidge, Vrine, and Sweat," did not simply stink, but had "an abhominable savour" (*WMP* 43). In his later anatomy, for example, George Thomson referred to the plague body as "the deletery ferment of this Heteroclite poison," and to suppurating matter as "poisonous liquamen" (*LPA* 77 & 72). Thomas Johnson's translation of the works of Ambrose Paré, published in 1634, also warned of the suppurating discharges of "evil juice" (Mullett 174). The moral language of purity and defilement, contamination and containment, pervaded the anatomical discourse of plague, both satirical and medical. Like monsters who "Spitt their vennim" (Sidney *Poems* 51), the infected were constructed out of "euill and corrupt humours" and transformed into nocuously deformed creatures at the very least through the anatomy (*AON* D1).

As the anatomy recounted, the plague body was early modern London's toxic signifier -- the immoral product of "poysoned and infected . . . sinnes" and a *memento mori* reminder of painful mortality (*APA* D8). In his dissective rants, the satirist fashioned a threatening infected body perpetually ejecting offensive and corrupting foulness. This was a body full of infection, seething and running in a disgusting array of dangerously contaminating fluids. Whether blood,[71] "vrines white and crude, or red, troubled and black,"[72] violent and stinking sweat,[73] or humid flux [74] the "superfluous excrements" were considered dangerous substances that were discharged from the body by "purging, vomiting, spitting, sweating, [or through the] urine" (*AM Pt 1 Sec 2*: 136). The deliberate and debasing inclusion of waste products – what Mary Douglas describes as the product of "pollution behaviour" -- was intended to reinforce the abject status of the plague body as a "repellent object" to be feared and avoided, by virtue of its defilingly sickened wastes which threatened the physical health and the moral purity of the city (Douglas 36).

---

[71] In *Loimographia: An Account of The Great Plague of 1665*, William Boghurst wrote that "Bleeding at the nose, 3,4,5, or 6 dayes together," was significant "after the beginning of the disease" (*LGP* 23).

In a limited sense, the infected body was somewhat like the uninfected excremental body described in Chapter One, as both bodies were evacuating machines of sorts. With respect to composition, however, what separated the infected excremental body from the uninfected body was the latter's scarcity of ordure. If anything, there was a pronounced absence of "Sir Reverence" or shit within the infected body (Henke 1979: 241).[75] Instead of ejecting simple excrement as the healthy body did, the somewhat constipated plague body was a discharger of everything but ordure it seemed,[76] as George Thomson explained in *Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized* [1666], with, of course, the odd exception of bloody dysenteria[77] and the blackened turds Lodge observered in his *A Treatise of the Plague* [1603].[78] Indeed, the inability to discharge effluents or "the transpiration of the excrements" invited infection, since such bodies were already "easily polluted and infected" (*WMP* 46). On a purely Neoplatonic level, the satirist intimated that the runny body mirrored the polluted epidemical city. London's sewery character combined with the stench of mass graves to produce its infamous "noysome" character. The diseased city's paragon was its diseased citizens who produced collective "noysomeness" through discharging sickness, mortality and the wastes of daily living. Throughout much of the plague satire, London was typically represented *in medias res* of disgust -- a city reduced to a sickened mass of suppurations and pre-Sartreian urban nausea -- an urban sink teeming in "vomite, reffize, [refuse], [and] Dunghill drosse," according to Edward Hake's *Newes out of Powles Churchyarde* [1579] (Hake F2).

---

[72] This was Lodge's urinary analysis from *A Treatise of the Plague* (Lodge *Comp Wks IV:* 21), but Boghurst also described "Urine shaddowing black after 3 or 4 dayes being sicke." See *Loimographia: An Account of The Great Plague of 1665*, 23.

[73] Ibid., 27. See also William Bullein's *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence*, 38.

[74] James Henke defines "humid flux" as any bodily "discharge of material." See *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays. Vol. 2*, 185.

[75] Perhaps infected bodies were only "Half-dung," as Marston argued, because they "haue theyr life from putrid slime" (*SOV* 62).

[76] There was good reason, as George Thomson explained in his anatomy of the plague body, why the plague body was considerably less excremental. Speaking of his own infection, Thomson described his "Fundament, where appeared in some few dayes a very great Bubo of the bigness of a Tennis-ball, quite stopping up the passage of the Anus" (*LPA* 91). Though apt at discharging via the mouth and other erupting body openings, the plague body seemed somewhat on the constipated side. In *Loimographia: An Account of The Great Plague of 1665*, William Boghurst even suggested that the "Stopping of urine on a suddain" (*LGP* 33) was also a likelihood.

[77] James Henke describes "Dysenteria" as "groping pain in the large intestines, mucous and bloody evacuations." See Henke's *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays. Vol. 2*, 142.

The satirist found other discharges more threatening than excrement owing to the fact that he was more concerned with the infected body's volatile impulse "to void the Excrements of grossest matter" (Sylvester *Comp Wks I*: 77); particularly the discharge of "bloody coloured" infectious matter which exited the body through the mouth, nose, genitals and sores (*LGP* 23). Within the plague body, there were more disgusting solids to be located than mere excrement. In the anatomy, oozing orifices or rupturous sores and their infectious emissions proved invaluable sources of satirical inspiration. From vomit to pus, spit to snot, and ooze to slime, the plague body was a diseased microcosm that spewed not dung, but liquified infection through its shameful wounds of erupting tokens, abscesses, buboes, boils, botches, blains, and carbuncles. Ordure, it seemed, was neither powerful nor aversive enough to defile the aversive character of the infected body. The healthy anal character of London was abandoned in order to call attention to what Joshua Sylvester called "The slime Burgers of [the] body" (Sylvester *Comp Wks I*: 76). Similarly, for John Marston, the infected sufferers were "the slime of this dung-pit" known as London (*MAL* V I 107). The viscous nature of discharging toxins escaping the infected body envelope were figured as poisonous and foregrounded because they produced disgust. While most inhabitants had a high tolerance for human dung, (considering that early moderners were surrounded by human waste within the teeming kennels, sinks and ditches of London), such was not the case for the human ooze, pus, slime, spit, snot, and vomit. By deliberately expounding upon the aversive nature of the body's more abject discharges, the satirist was trying to bolster the disgust of infection. Indeed, the visual and tactile aversion to these discharging substances offends us as much, if not more, than it did the early moderns. As the satyr-anatomist emphasized, the suffering body was a suppurating body discharging pestilential pollution within its own walls of flesh and within the city walls: a grotesque setting where the foulest body "spit[s] in the fowlest place" (*AA* D5).

---

[78] In the infected body, Lodge noted "crampes, blacknesse in the excrements of the body, [and] Stench." See *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge Vol. IV*, 21.

On the subject of foul spit, vomit seemed to be repellingly omnipresent as John Davies of Hereford and Phillip Stubbes complained. Epidemical London was, especially for Davies, a city "Of Tauerns, reaking still with vomitings," and an urban space where even "The Graues do often vomit out their dead" (*TD* 228 & 239).[79] But vomit had an distinctively abject status in plague time because of all the fowlest spits to project from the infected body, vomit was perhaps the most threatening discharge. "The putrid stuffe, which thou doest spit" that Donne described, played a predominant role in the anatomy of the infected body (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 362). The "desire to vomit" or the "wambling of the stomacke" (Boraston 20) could not be contained within its heaving walls because infected "bodies [we]re full of [the] excrementitious iuices" of infection (*WMP* 46). Taking William Perkins description into account, "The writhing of the lippes, the turning of the neck the buckling of the ioynts and the whole body, [that] proceed of cramps and convulsions, which follow after much evacuation," made the semiotics of suffering not only disgusting but unpleasantly abject at best (*ASF* 16).[80] In Simon Kellwaye's and William Boghurst's anatomies, both medical writers complained of the sufferer's "Continuall vomitting which will not be staide" (*ADP* 16 & *LGP* 22), which further fortified the satirist's position that the infected body was a puke factory of sorts with vomit "pouring out of one side of their mouth just as you pour liquor out of a pot at one side" (*LGP* 41).

---

[79] Leviticus 18:25, 18:28, and 20:22 also convey a sense of the land vomiting its inhabitants.

Vomit, for satirist and physician alike, not only triggered violent disgust,[81] but in times of epidemic, the "vomite yellowe cholour" (*DFP* 38) of nausea and the "vomiting [of] humours bitter and of diuers colours" were additional signs of infection (Boraston: 20). Thomas Fuller argued in his *A Sermon Intended for Pavl's Crosse* [1626], for example, "Vomiting I am sure is one of the certainest signes of the plague" (Fuller 8). Of all "Spittles of diseases," then, vomit regularly signalled plague (Donne *Comp Eng Poems*: 174). Again, vomit was not only a physical substance but a spiritual one as well, as Bartholomew Robertson in *Anatomie of a distressed Soule* [1619], described the soul wallowing in its own vomit.[82]

---

[80] Although Antonin Artaud is writing in the twentieth century, the founder of the Theatre of Cruelty's portrayal of the infected body mirrors the perspective of the early modern satirist. According to Artaud: "His crazed body fluids, unsettled and commingled, seem to be flooding through his flesh. His gorge rises, the inside of his stomach seems as if it were trying to gush out between his teeth." See *The Theatre and Its Double*, 19.

[81] See Rozin, Haidt & McCauley's article on "Disgust" argues, "vomit is a primary substance for disgust" See *Handbook of Emotions*, 579.

[82] In *Anatomie of a distressed Soule* [1619], Robertson described the "Soule" bemoaning: "I haue wallowed in my owne vomit" (Robertson 1619: 2). Similarly, John Marston also described spiritual vomit as "the slime that from our soules doe flow" (*SOV* 76).

Despite emphasizing the moral and the spiritual because satirical authors lacked medical knowledge, medical writers regularly substantiated satirical observers in ruminations of their own. In a slightly more precise methodology, George Donne and William Boraston, defined vomiting as "the eighth sign of infection" (*SIP* 1 & Boraston 20). Under the rubric "Signes of being infected," the physician Stephen Bradwell observed of an infected sufferer: "offering to vomit, or vomiting filthy stuffed of divers colours, yellow, greene, and blackish" (*WMP* 51). Medical writers such as Bradwell, Thomson and Boghurst, augmented the grotesqueness of the satirical anatomy by describing, in detail, the technicolour nausea, the "spitting and pissing of blood," and the "flux of the belly and looseness" which all made their contaminating exits from the infected body (*LGP* 85). The ejecting reality of the plague body lent further credence to the satirical anatomy, because violent retching was established as an integral part of infection. As part of the accumulated noxiousness of sin and infection, infectious vomit was to be avoided at all costs.

From the most offensive discharge, we move to the least offensive, but perhaps most predominant discharge of epidemic: tears. Thomas Swadling wrote to his readers – "The time presses you enough; for let but your eyes imagine, they see their eyes, who are shut up by the plague, watering and washing their bed, bedewing their cheekes" -- watery eyes fell from both saint and sufferer (Swadling 65). Understandably, mourning was prominent in much of the discourse of plague, as Brewer's *The Weeping Lady: Or, London Like Ninivie in Sack-Cloth* [1625] and William Muggins' *Londons Mourning Garment or Funerall Teares* [1603] testified, where "With blubbered checkes, bedewde with trickling teares, / With minde opprest lamenting griefs that flowe, / London lament[ed]" each recurring epidemic (*LMG* B1). But it was not the tears of survivors of "this heauily bewayled Contagion" that were of interest to the satyr-anatomist (*TWL* C4). He was much more concerned with the "scalding Teares" (*LMG* B3); the cathartic and polluted tears produced by "hideous cries, and [the] howlings of despair" of the infected (*BRII* 515).

Within the anatomy, the "dimme and blinde" (*DFP* 132) "deiected eies" (*TWL* B1) "Sunke deepe into [the] head" of the sufferer revealed interior corruption and melancholy (*ADP* 16). George Donne and Thomas Thayre agreed that the "Diuers and heauie lookes of the eyes" had a chameleon quality, because in the throws of infection, the eyes that "doe scarce peepe out of their heads" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks IV*: 95) "changed in their colours" (*SIP* 1 & *ATP* F3). Perhaps the most disturbing feature of sufferer were the dreaded "red eyen" irises Bullein mentioned in *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578] (*DFP* 38). As they drifted in and out of consciousness, sufferers "Sle[pt] with the eyes half open, half shutt" (*LGP* 35) with "flint-stones (like pearles) in their eies" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks IV*: 109). The freakish qualities of the eyes of the infected were, within the anatomy, windows to abject, if not demonic, souls.

With "the eyes staring or weeping, the face terrible, [and] the sayde excrements" teeming down the sufferer's cheeks, tears of the infected were far less threatening than the body's other evacuating contaminants (*ADP* 16). Though contaminating and infectious in a limited sense, the disgust of tears remained remarkably tempered. As aversive as the infected tears might have become in the more realist representations, none of the diseased weeping matched Nashe's excremental lachrymation within the allegorical *Christes Teares Ouer Ierusalem* [1593]. In this tract, Nashe set a new standard in disgust as he had Christ shitting the foulest of tears over the city.[83] While the anatomy recorded no dungy tears of infection, the profusion of bloody tears was projected by John Trapp in *Gods Love-*

---

[83] "Black and cindry (like Smithes-water) are those excrements," said Christ, in Nashe's allegory, "that source down my cheekes, and farre more sluttish then the vglie oous of the channell" (Nashe *Wks II*: 36).

Tokens and the Afflicted Mans Lessons [1637]. In this tract, Trapp maintained that plague would only be forestalled when the infected sinners wept "teares of blood from [their] hearts" (Trapp 209). For better or worse, no bloody tears were shed. Nevertheless, "Blood pollute[d] the land" through other means (Num. 35:33).

Bloody discharges from the plague body, as they would have been for the healthy body, were a cause for particular alarm. As Thomas Walkington expressed in *The Optick Glasse of Hvmors* [1607], "blood is the oile of the lampe of our life"; the substantial loss of blood due to infection proved lethal to the sufferer and perilous to the healthy (*OGH* I1). The "frail blood" of those most "liable to sin," regularly escaped the body through a variety of body openings, including the genitals (Henke 1974: 160).[84] The loss of blood also prompted fear and disgust because of all body emissions, whether feces, vomit, saliva or urine, blood was the most aversive discharge to exit the body (Rozin, Haidt, and & McCauley 582). Like suppurating matter, blood too, could take on the macabre hue of death: black.[85] Not only fearsome, blood was, as Numbers 35:33 and the anatomy emphasized, a "polluting" force.

When George Wither described the plague as a "bloody Messenger" in *Britains Remembrancer* [1626], he was not only speaking of the mass mortality of plague, but the loss of blood experienced through infection (*BRI* 283). In a sense, Wither, like James Godskall, contended that "The sicknesse of the plague [wa]s an issue of blood" (*TKM* E1). Many satirists envisioned plague as a divine purge or an essential blood-letting of the conscience.[86] Wither explained that the wrath of God was a necessary corrective: "This Land is so diseas'd that many doubt / (Before it mend) some blood must issue out" (*BRII*: 427). Somewhat similar to the way in which the sufferers' "Physicians either exhaust their Blood, consume their Spirits by deletery uncorrected Catharticks, torture, crucifie and gall them with Blisterings, Cuppings, and Scarifyings," plague also wreaked havoc on and within the infected body (*LPA* 124). Though "blood lettyng and pilles doe helpe and cleanse the Pestilence when it beginneth firste to boile within the bodie," or so Bullein's Medicus suggested, blood escaping from the body envelope without medical intervention was the most ominous sign of "hot" pestilential mortality (*DFP* 41).

---

[84] In *Loimographia: An Account of The Great Plague of 1665*. William Boghurst spoke of the "pissing of blood" (*LGP* 5) and the "bloody coloured" (Ibid. 23) "urine" of the infected body.

[85] In the final septic stages of infection, the body circulated "blackish blood" (*LPA* 75) according to Thomson's anatomy of the plague body, *Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized* [1666].

Partial to volcanic metaphors,[87] the satirists, "Amid the ragings of this hot Infection" (*BRII* 129), dissected bodies boiling at infernal temperatures, or as Simon Kellwaye and Thomas Lodge explained, bodies that "haue a great fiyre" (*ADP* 16) or an "intollerable heate in the inward" (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 21). Because of the increased temperature, the skin, mucous membranes and sphincters were unable to contain "the heat and boyling of blood" which inevitably erupted from the infected sufferer (Drout D2). According to Bullein's anatomical musings, the plague body was "ingendered of most sharpe hotte and grosse blood" with its "internall partes boiling with heate and burning" (*DFP* 45 & 38). Thus it was inevitable that blood would discharge from one of the infected openings, of which the nose was the most dominant breach.

---

[86] In the *Ravens Almanacke* [1609], for example, Dekker told his readers: "I aduize you al to purge your soules, and let blood your consciences, for otherwise a Hempen-plague wil so hang vpon you, that the pest-cart of Newgate will carrie your bodyes away in heapes to be buried vnder Tyborne" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks IV*: 192).

[87] The magmatic matter the early modern satirist depicted in the infected body still resonates in the twentieth century. Antonin Artaud, the French dramatist, was also partial to the fugurative possibilities of the volcanic body. Describing pestilential infection, Artaud explains: "Soon the body fluids, furrowed like the earth struck by lightning, like lava kneaded by subterranean forces, search for an outlet." See *The Theatre and Its Double*, 19.

William Boghurst argued that it was not just the "spitting and pissing of blood" (*LGP* 85) but "Bleeding at the nose, 3,4,5, or 6 dayes together," that was most perilously significant "after the beginning of the disease" (*LGP* 23). While the nose was essential for survival -- it enabled Londoners detect and avoid noisome infections -- the proboscis that appeared "sharpe, & growing as it were crooked" (*ADP* 27), also "serve[d] as a Gutter / To void the Excrements of grossest matter," wrote Joshua Sylvester (Sylvester *Comp Wks I*: 77). Although Sylvester was alluding to a slightly more healthy nose, the nose of the infected discharged not mucus or the "snuff" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 24) of "filthy ordure,"[88] but rather, the "extreame bleeding at the nose" voided hot contaminating blood (*ADP* 16). For the plague sufferer, then, the nasal passages became contaminating orifices for poisonous "bloued distillyng from the nose"; small openings for dispensing infectious plasma (*DFP* 38).

Whether in its ebony form or its traditional sanguine hue, discharged blood was volatile matter one was recommended to avoid contact with. Reinforcing the fear of infection, the satirical anatomy directly recommended shunning infectious discharges, which indirectly, meant shunning the tainted sufferers. As both satirists and physicians agreed, the infected posed a real threat to the healthy masses because of their infectious effluents. By virtue of its agenda and method, the satirical anatomy had reduced the political animal to a polluting monster -- a suppurating beast -- a disgusting and contaminating body out of control, leaking its putrid and reeking substances outside of the body envelope. The contaminating force of the infected was articulated most clearly by William Bullein in *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578] where Bullein voiced the phobic reality of life in epidemical London where "people sicke [were] goyng abrode with the plague sore running, stinkyng, and infectyng the whole; vnwise, rashe, passing with an emptie stomake out of the house" (*DFP* 43). The paranoia of contamination was extreme in early modern London as Paul Slack suggests: "Everything connected with the sick, down to their pots and pans, was thrown way, once plague was suspected" (Slack 1992: 19). The social response to contain contamination was instituted through a program of segregation and incarceration set out under the auspices of "The Plague Orders." The "Orders," which were first enforced in 1518, were updated over the century of recurring plagues.[89] These disciplinarian regulations were, for the most part, inconsistently carried out by a surveillant army of constables, watchmen, warders, beadles, searchers, physicians, examiners, nurses, rakers, and sweepers with limited and controversial success.[90]

---

[88] Thomas Randolph described the nasal discharge of drunk thus: "The Braine o'rewarm'd (loosing sweet repose) / Doth purge her filthy ordure through the nose" (Thomas 64).

The intention of the "interventionalist and regulatory" Plague Orders of London were designed to contain infection by managing unmanagable bodies owing to the fact that leaking plague bodies could not control themselves (Slack 1992: 339). In an attempt to contain contamination, the infected and those suspected of infection were quarantined in pest-houses or incarcerated in their "marked" infected houses for a period of forty days. As Thomas Vicary observed of decontaminating efforts of the Plague Orders in *The Anatomie of the Bodie of Man* [1548]: "Blue Crosses [were] to be set on infected Houses; Gutters to be flusht; [and] Bedding [was to be] burnt" (Vicary 1548: 7). Given the historical context, the paranoia was justified, and the decontamination measures of the Plague Orders were most often appropriate, but this is not to suggest that the orders were not met with suspicion and hostility from the satirist or the citizen. Little or no concern for the uninfected, for example, who were incarcerated with the infected was voiced. If plague was contaminating and contagious by association, the authorities condemned the healthy to an almost certain death. Whatever the case, as James Godskall argued, purifying the city of its own urban effluents was a futile exercise without first purging London of sin. As Godskall said of the epidemic of 1603:

---

[89] For a detailed examination of the Plague Orders of early modern London see F.P. Wilson's *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* [1963], 15-20; and Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* [1990], 213-15, 223, 277, 303 & 328.

[90] In his *Diary*, John Evelyn recalled the disciplinary mechanism of the city to control plague. According to Evelyn: "1625. I was this yeare (being the first of the reigne of King Charles) sent by my Father to Lewes in Sussex, to be with my Grandfather, with whom I pass'd my Child-hood: This was that yeare in which the Pestilence was so Epidemical, that there dy'd in Lond. 5000 a Weeke; & I well remember the strict Watches, and examination upon the Ways as we pass'd" (Evelyn 5).

> The former yeer wee haue vsed & followed many good orders to stay the bodily infectiō, purged our house clensed our streets, perfumed our apparell, had vpon our doors bils & red crosses, shuned infectious places, let out the corrupted bloud, abstained frō euil meats, emptied our houses of dogs, ayred with fire, caried in our hands diuerse confections of art & such more: what ought wee not the to do this yeer to stay the plague of sin? (*TKM* N7)

With the shame and stench of sin lingering throughout London, the city had no hope of staying the infection unless the foul air cleared.

As this chapter has argued, satirical writers seized upon the shock and sensationalism of epidemical bodies. The anatomy maintained that the deforming powers of pestilence mirrored the grotesque essence of plague and the abject sins that produced the disease. The stigmatic sores, which engulfed the body surface, were catalogued in an allegorical taxonomy. Sores were considered divine wounds of providential violence, retribution meted out as a moral corrective. In the metaphorical war against plague, the satirical anatomy drew a picture of a losing battle, however. And while epidemical visitations depopulated London, the anatomy dehumanized London as satirical writers consistently blamed Londoners for the casualties of epidemic. The shame-based rhetoric of the anatomy was poignantly misanthropic, a philippic dissection intended to disgrace and condemn the collective sin of London which prompted the recurring visitations.

By preying on the empirical reality of infection, satyr-anatomists created mythical bodies loosely based in corporeality. The infected body somewhat resembled the healthy body, in that both bodies were renowned for their discharging natures. But where the uninfected body discharged its excremental essence, the plague body discharged menacing infection. With its infectious blood, sweat, tears, spit, and vomit, the infected body threatened contamination and contagion. Even the colour spectrum of infection was profoundly significant. The *dis-eased* body was a defiling construct made abject through the anatomy, a sublime fabrication of the satirical imagination. Owing to the phobic nature of pestilential effluents and the ignorance of disease transmission, the discharging plague body inspired the terror and disgust conveyed within the satirical anatomy.

But as intimidating as the watery suppurations and grotesque effluents of infection appeared to be, the most alarming discharge to exit the plague body was an invisible one: stench. Moving beyond the discharging terrain of the infected body, then, it is necessary to explore the taxonomy of infectious smells which emanated from the plague body. Between the foul smell of the city and the stench of the sufferer, Londoners were caught in a threatening interplay of toxic odours. And as the closing chapter will demonstrate, stinks were the most perilous enemy to an individual's nose and to public health. All smells were important cultural phenomena for the early moderns, but it was the stench of pestilence that induced terror in the reader while inspiring disgust in the satyr-anatomist.

Chapter 4
The Infected Body II

The Stench of Infection: Anatomising 'Noysome' Effluvia

Throughout the early modern period, natural[1] and supernatural[2] causes of airy infections, including those produced by miasmatic winds,[3] infectious clouds,[4] the operation of planets,[5] the bowels of the earth,[6] infectious dunghills,[7] God's angels,[8] Satanic ayres,[9] and "noysome" doppelgängers,[10] all circulated and abounded without general consensus. Smells were an important cultural phenomenon for early moderns because "Before germ theory existed, nauseating smells bore the burden of carrying disease" (Miller *Anatomy*: 66). Within the anatomy, "this mortiferous Tyrant the Pest" (*LPA* 39), satirical writers considered plague as much a smell as a disease.[11] Similar to the way it had been interpreted by the medieval and Renaissance French who used *peste* or pestilence to signify "both the disease and the revolting stench associated with it," dissecting the odours of "the Pest"[12] was an intrinsic part of the satirical anatomy in early modern London (Le Guérer 43).

---

[1] In *A Dialogue of the Feuer Pestilence*, William Bullein cited Galenical theory in which a foul-smelling miasma carried the plague from one destination to another. Echoing Galen, "stronge Windes," wrote Bullein, "doe carrie pestilent fume or vapours from stinkyng places to the cleane partes" (*DFP* 6). Galen's theories persisted throughout the seventeenth century and influenced the anatomist George Thomson. Writing during the Great Plague, Thomson explained his evolving theory of miasma this way: "Touching the Material Cause, it is a venemous Gas, or wild Spirit, produced either inwardly from some degenerate Matter conceived within the Body, or outwardly received from some fracedinous noisome Exhalations contained in the pores of the air, taking their Original from several putrid bodies excited to fermentation, rarified and opened by the Ambient, altered and moved by Celestial Influences" (*LPA* 8-9).

[2] As Keith Thomas notes, "Most of those who saw plague as the product of divine wrath assumed that God worked through natural causes, bringing the epidemic by contagion or by the putrefaction of the air, according to whichever theory they favoured" (Thomas 86).

[3] In *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578], William Bullein spoke of or when stronge Windes [that] doe carrie pestilent fume or vapours from stinkyng places to the cleane partes" (*DFP* 36).

[4] Thomas Brewer, in *The Weeping Lady: Or, London like Ninivie in Sack-Cloth* [1625], described the miasmatic infection as "the Cloude of miserie" (*TWL* C4).

[5] Nashe, like other satirists, attacked the notion that the planets brought plague into London. In *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem* [1593], Nashe argued, "The Astronomers, they assigne it to the regiment and operation of Planets.. They say Venus, Mars, or Saturne, are motiues thereof, and neuer mention our sinnes, which are his chief procreatours" (Nashe *Wks II*: 172).

[6] William Kemp's *A Brief Treatise of the Nature, Causes, Signes, Preservation From and Cure of The Pestilence* [1665] echoed the early moderns who argued "The Air also may be corrupted by the Exhalations and Vapours that ascend out of the bowels of the Earth, wherein are many poisonous Minerals" (*ABT* 13-14).

[7] In *Summers Last Will and Testament* [1600] Nashe mentioned the circulating notion that "too many dunghils are infectious" (Nashe *Comp Wks III*: 284).

[8] According to James Godskall in *The kings medicine for this present yeere 1604*, "the Lord hath commanded his Angel to infect the ayre, to hunt & annoy vs" (*TKM* C1).

[9] As the previous example demonstrates, Godskall was more speculative than many of his contemporaries, as he also pondered the possibility that "Satan is the ayre which doeth infect the soule: this ayre is worser then the infection of the elementall ayre. For the Satanicall ayre is euery where, in all contries, Kingdomes, cities, townes and villages" (*TKM* C5).

[10] J.D., in *Salomons Pest-Hovse, or Towre-Royall. Newly Re-Edified to preserve Londoners with their Families, and others, from the doubted Deluge of the Plague* [1630], explained the miasmatic geist this way: "the Lord hath a Pursiuant, which he sendeth to arrest some in the pure ayre, namely the Plague it selfe" (J.D. 2).

By conjuring remembrances of stinks past and present, a variety of writers anatomised the repellent powers urban life, death, and disease. Analyzing and categorizing stinks that breached the smell register was an unpleasant task in a cultural context where "olfactory intolerance and social and moral disgust went hand in hand" (Ibid. 31). In response to the stench, the literature of epidemic resounded with a renewed intolerance to plague-related odour.[13] Understandably, the noxiousness of epidemic signalled extreme danger in many writings. In the anatomy of plague, the "pestilential taint" increasingly took on moralistic properties, however (Hodges 12). Satirists and medical writers alike, inhaled the fetid muse of epidemic London constructing a synonymous link between air pollution and moral pollution in the process. While many writers condemned the filth and stench of epidemical London, they condemned the sins of the city in the same pious breaths.

Within this "ambitious foul infirmity," most writers on plague envisioned noisome London through moral spectacles, gazing down upon a city where filth, stink, disease and morality were all inextricably linked (*RL* 150). Without question, the stench of pestilence was morally freighted: plague-related odours signified death, suffering, and sin. Again, the olfactoral interpretation of plague was not an Renaissance construction. The early moderns remained inheritors of the medieval notion that smells were powerful symbols of piety and sin and satirists exploited the relationship whenever they sought fit. As the theologian John Wycliffe put it in the fourteenth century, smells were olfactoral signifiers of either good or evil: "Some men [we]re good smelling and some [we]re stinking to God" (Wycliffe 107-08). Shakespeare, as Carol Spurgeon observes, "expresse[d] the height of disgust and horror through the medium of revolting smells, and that to his imagination sin and evil deeds always smell foully" (Spurgeon 79). In the words of Simon Kellwaye, "Our odours stinke" because "the imaginations of our harts be only euill continually" (*ADP* B1). Kellwaye, a licensed physician, intimated here that a righteous change of "hart" and pious living would inevitably clear the air of London. Perhaps a nonsensical notion for us, but a practical approach for the anatomising satirist who sometimes sought moral reform through medicine.

---

[11] Similarly, in ***Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized*** [1666], George Thomson spoke of "the venemous Arrow of the direful Pest" (*LPA* 3).

[12] The "pest" was a popular shortened epithet for pestilence. In 1568, Gilbert Skeyne offered readers ***Ane Breve Description of the Pest*** [1568] and in 1604, Francis Herring's *A Modest Defence* [1604], still described "The pest," as "a sharpe contagious disease" (Herring 1604: A3).

[13] Owing to the odiferous smell of death and infection in his legitimate anatomy, George Thomson was forced to place "a porringer containing Sulphur to burn under the Corps" (*LPA* 71).

This final chapter will provide a concluding overview of the most noxious discharge of plague: pestilential stench. As this chapter will elucidate, the satirical anatomy both dissected and catalogued the noisome effluvia of infection in noxious detail. By virtue of its fetid essence, the dissection of plague-related stinks conveyed both moral and physical disgust. The opening section focuses upon the satyr-anatomist who was burdened with the unsavoury task of dissecting and cataloguing the foul miasmatic smells of plague. In appropriating circulating theories of contagion, the anatomy derived a *pastiche* medley of miasmatic theories haphazardly lumped into a hybrid moral framework which attempted to explain why plague was as much an abject smell as it was an abject disease. By virtue of its discursive method, the anatomy of foul smells dissected a lethal miasmatic force like no other, for, as

Edmund Spenser professed, "the great contagion direfull deadly stunck" (*FQ* II ii 4 10). The phobic response to these abject stinks is the concern of the next section. The defiling moral properties of smells not only threatened the life of the physical body, but threatened the well-being of the spiritual body. In the following section, the proto-Malthusian logic of the anatomy is explored. Within the satirical anatomy, many writers blamed the poor for plague while rationalizing the high mortality rates of the impoverished as a necessary culling of an unwanted population. The anatomy figured London's destitute populace as a primary miasmatic vector of plague. Indeed, the poor not only smelled of poverty but stunk of plague. This chapter concludes with an examination of the most toxic and repulsive stench of infection, the transpiration of airborne bodily effluents which were considered highly toxic and contagious, but most of all, exceedingly aversive.

Because the intertwined bodies mirrored one another, a synoptic dissection of the diseased urban body can only enhance our understanding of the infected body. The opening section seeks to do just that. Through the combined olfactoral theories of the ancient, the medieval and the early modern, London satirists collectively charted plague's noxious volatility into unrefined atomic categories but with refined moral connotations.

'Plague-Smeller Purseuvants' and the Noxious Volatility of 'Stinckes'

In an early modern city where the faint odour of sanctity did battle with the oppressive stench of sin, the sensory function of smell figured prominently in the anatomy. The olfactoral response to plague was particularly revealing because the offensive odours of disease carried a moral stigma.: the greater the stench, the greater the sin. Most satyr-anatomists demonstrated they were well-versed in the aesthetics of stink. The smells they dissected can be viewed, however, as unveiled attempts to cleanse and purge London of its moral and physical corruption. As Shakespearean plays and much Elizabethan drama shows, the volatility of scent and its destructive power went hand in hand. In order to emphasize the loathsomeness of the diseased air, then, satirical writers descended into the sphere of disgust to dissect and chart the miasmic vectors of the most "villainous smell that ever / offended nostril": the stench of pestilence (*MWW* III v 92-93).

To augment the disdainful relationship satirists drew between stench and sin and the interconnection between stench and disease that helped define plague as "a noysome syckness," the satirists anatomised the invisible airy stinks of pestilence they detected (Osiander B3-4). Like Dekker's "Bel-ringer Smelling what strong scent he had in his nose" in *The Belman of London* [1608] (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks III*: 302), Jonson's drunken narrator from "On the Famous Voyage" [1616], also complained of the foul smells that polluted London's air, on which "Hung stench, diseases, and old filth" (Jonson *Poems*: 53). The scatological realism of epidemic that Dekker and Jonson articulated was likely more mimetic than we care to imagine. London's plaguy noxiousness was overpowering.

During epidemics, as the satirical literature suggests, London's malodorous presence was more than the visceral smell of filth. As John Downame argued, this macrocosmic body of stink emitted the very "dregs of corruption" (*SPT* 19). The anatomy demonstrated that plague time exuded its own diseased odour – an airy something – a toxic miasma that was combinedly "noisome, greiuous, and painefull" (*SPA* B30). During each of its dreadful visitations, an airborne "Cloude of miserie" was writ large over the city (*TWL* C4). For many satirists, plague resembled an invisible toxic smog descending on a defenceless and paranoid population. The infectious rain that fell upon London was, of course, as Petowe and Nashed argued, not a haphazard downpour, from "the congealed mudde of gorie Clowdes" discharged by an "ouer-cast GOD sitting in his Throne," but a "selective" infectious shower descending upon those deserving of plague (Nashe *Wks II*: 21).

Although the Jacobeans had their self-proclaimed "Watchman for the Pest," even the gifted physician, Stephen Bradwell, could not see or much less save London from this invisible enemy. Paranoia was, therefore, rife in the anatomy, because of the highly contagious nature of the noxious miasma.[14] According to the anatomy, ingesting this air-borne poison was either gathered through the inhalation of breath or the absorption of the infection through body pores and orifices. Immediate contact with the stench, according to Bullein, caused "the arters drawe to the harte when it panteth, the pestilenciall ayre and poyson" (*DFP* 44). The pestilential miasma was universally contagious because, according to the preacher Robert Abbot, like Philo of Alexandria long before him,[15] plague threatened all living matter. Abbot maintained that plague "poysoneth the spirits, both Animall and Vitall, choking the one in the braine, and stifling and ouercomming the other in the heart: yea, it Infecteth Houses, Clothes, Breath, and the Aire it selfe" (Abbot 2).

---

[14] In *Utopia* [1516], Sir Thomas More shared this paranoia of contagious stink. Predictably, the Utopians took appropriate measures to prevent the generation of pestiferous miasmas. As More explained, "Neither they suffer anything that is filthy, loathsome, or uncleanly to be brought into the city, lest the air, by the stench thereof infected and corrupt, should cause pestilent diseases" (More 71).

[15] As Philo of Alexandria said in *De aeternitate mundi*: "plague is nothing other than the death of the air, which spreads its own sickness for the corruption of even the smallest living thing" (Le Guérer 42).

While physicians and satirists persisted in defining plague as an airborne disease – "the noysome Pestilence" (*APA* 1; Anderson B3;) – a divine wrath or a "noysome . . . iudgement" (*APA* A11) – transmission was dominantly delivered through secondary miasmatic causes. To put it another way, "Nature" was, as Donne suggested, "God's immediate commissioner" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 340). More puritanical writers like George Wither and the Calvinist Henoch Clapham disagreed of course. "It was no noysome Ayre, no Sewre, or Stinke, / Which brought this death" argued Wither, but God's angel with "His pois'ned Arrowes of the Pestilence" (*BRII*: 96 & *BRI*: 32). Despite the dissention between satirists, most authors attacked the more secular theories since they all acquiesced on the moral cause of plague: infectious sin. In Thomas Swadling estimation, "the sinne, alas, is universall, and the punishment [therefore], Epidemicall" (Swadling 87).

For the anatomising satirist, pestilential miasma was the noxious essence of sin. In *Englands Sicknes* [1615], for example, Thomas Adams explained miasmatic transgressions this way: "The thicke and foggy aire of this sinfull world" resembled "the smoake and stenchfull mists ouer some populous Cities" (*ES* 50). John Weever, in *A Prophecy of this present year 1600* [1600], for example, likened the stench of sin to pestiferous ditchwater: "Sins like a puddle or mattery sink / The more we stir them, still the more they stink" (Gransden 140). In this odiferous volley, as Anthony Synnot points out, "Odour contribute[d] not only to the moral construction of the self, but also to the moral construction of the group" (Synnot 194). But whether generated by miasmas or sewery sins, plague was ever-present in the air of Renaissance London.

Since the smells of plague were particularly nasty, as the satirists clearly articulated, it made sense to assume that London, at its most fetid epidemic heights, must have been emitting an sinful or even evil aura. To combat the stench, more practical, rather than discursive, methods were taken. Achieving piety or fresh air through pomanders and nosegays were ineffectual and limited solutions for combatting the overpowering force of urban and epidemical stench. Purifying the air of London was a Herculean task and the tactics of deodorization or "Correction of the Air" proposed by the College of Physicians, in *Certain Necessary Directions*, were well intended but largely ineffective. Like his early modern forbears, William Boghurst, writing during the Great Plague [1665], still recommended the Hippocratic regime employed during the Black Death[16] of "making fires in the streets," and also the "washing of streets, choosing high grounds or hills to live on, shutting up houses, burning infected linen or woollen, anointing the nostrils" (*LGP* 55). But the burning of nitre, tar, resin, and old leather and horn, brought fleeting liberation from stench as did flash gunpowder in frying pans.[17] Many Londoners breathed through their mouths while others took to plugging their nostrils with pellets of wormwood and rue.[18] Desperate for a respite from stink, "Some people brought animals into the house, especially goats, whose rank odour was highly esteemed as a preventive" (Priestly 109). Despite their efforts and budgets, even the best and most expensive pomanders and nosegays, or even pedigreed goats, for that matter, were little competition for the fetid stench of the smelly city. The pleasant "Sweet smelling gummes, and odoriferous spice[s]" were inevitably overpowered by the urban stench of London, for the putrefaction of the city produced an overabundance of overwhelming foul miasmas (*BRII*: 400). "Their Yards, and Halls," that Wither spoke of, "were smoked with perfueme, / To stop the stinkes, which thither might presume," offered only temporary relief as the stench soon returned (*BRI* 132). Satirical tracts like Roger Fenton's *A Perfume against the noysome Pestilence* [1603] explained that the essential disgust of plague could not be eliminated by the mere masking of stench, it took piety and repentance to clear the air.

---

[16] As George Deux notes:

> Hippocrates attributed pestilence to a distempering of the atmosphere, and quite logically suggested as a preventive the correction of atmospheric disruptions by the kindling of large fires. The fires, presumably, would correct the excessive humidity, and may also have been intended to destroy by fumigation the effluvia corrupting the air. Hippocrates' example of kindling fires was to be followed in the 14th century, most importantly by the papal physician Guy de Chauliac. (Deaux 17)

[17] See Charles Mullett's *The Bubonic Plague and England: An Essay in the History of Preventative Medicine*, 464.

[18] See James Leasor's *The Plague and the Fire*, 16.

While pestilential stinks were often considered hellish or demonic in origin, a notion inherited from medieval concepts[19] debated by Gascoigne and Dekker among others,[20] ambiguity remained since consistency was not a resolute hallmark of the anatomy. At times, in the anatomy, it was hard to tell the poison from the cure. While good smells were considered curative,[21] Sir John Harington argued the reverse. In *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* [1596], Harington claimed, in his own Paracelsian vein,[22] "some Physicians say, the smell of a Jakes is good against the plague" (*MOA* 134). Harington's tract advised Londoners to ingest the semi-noxious poison of the privy, as an antidote against the supreme poison of all: the plague. In a similar vein, a Continental "fire philosopher" even recommended inhaling "bottled wind," although the technology for the process remained hypothetical at best.[23] In any case, jakes whiffing and bottled wind sniffing as pestilential prophylactics were likely not the most popular or appetizing counteragents for plague.

---

[19] Miller cites the *Middle English Dictionary*: "What stynk and what corrupcioun, what filthe and what abhominacioun is there [in hell]." See William Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust*, 151.

[20] In *Worke For Armourours* [1609] Dekker described London's Bear Gardens. As Dekker put it, "the very noyse of the place" put him "in mind of Hel" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks IV*: 97). Similarly, George Gascoigne, in *The Droome of Doomesday* [1576], also likened London to the demoniacal depths of hell. "For as in hell ther are fier, cold, styncke, darknesse, wormes, confusion, thyrst, and hatefuness, of all that is good and honest" (Gascoigne *Comp Wks III*: 318), this was London to Gascoigne the satirist.

[21] See William Miller's *The Anatomy of Disgust*, 66.

[22] Paracelsus maintained that "Man's dung, or excrement, hath very great virtues, because it contains in it all the noble essences, viz: of the Food and Drink" (Rosebury 123).

[23] See Johannes Nohl's *The Black Death: A Chronicle of the Plague Compiled From Contemporary Sources*, 65-66.

In terms of endorsing any specific preventative measures, the anatomy remained divided. What the satirists did agree on was that the plague body and the epidemical body of London both carried the scent of disgust; the fetid odour John Bullokar defined as "dislike" (Bullokar F3), and a foul scent Carolus Linnaeus [1707-78] would eventually classify as *Nauseosos* --"nauseating or disgusting"-- in his *Odores Medicamentorum* [1752]. The plague transmitted "smells worse" than the "asafoetida" Dekker described in *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603] (*PPD* 21). Regardless of the miasmal epithets they recruited, however, most leading intellects concluded that of all malodorous threats confronted by early modern Londoners, the "pestilent airs with flavours to repulse"[24] outstunk them all. Indeed, what united all anatomising writers whose olfactoral senses were devoted to foul odours was the "dangerous savagery inherent in the sense of smell" (Classen, Howes and Synott 4). The disgust of plague odours inspired loathing and terror in satirists and in civilians.

These fearful interpretations of smells derived out of the anatomies reinforced the phobic response to the stench of pestilence. The hysteria created by the phobia of bad smells was especially rampant in plague time. Even a conservative historical reading of the epidemical experience suggests early modern Londoners must have experienced olfactoral overload of Jonsonian proportions at the height of plague. Within the anatomy, however, plague odours demanded an aversive response which was both moral and physical. Just as bad smells often signalled danger, for the early moderns, the smell of plague was the smell of fear. As Andreas Osiander explained, "the Pestilence is a noysome syckness, not because it bryngeth death . . .

---

[24] W. Cavendish cited in Classen, Howes and Synott's *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell,* 66.

but because that it taketh awaye the people very sodenlye unloked for and unawares" (Osiander B3-B4). The lethal swiftness of plague and its miasmic detectability compelled all who could, to flee the city to escape the noisome contagion. In this refinedly crude analysis of foul pestilential smells, the "many red-nosed pursevants" of Elizabethan and Jacobean London recorded a fetid array of olfactoral interpretations which helped reinforce the early modern phobic contempt for plague (*UFT* 29).

In the anatomy of stench, satirical writers like Ben Jonson in "On the Famous Voyage," "trie[d] the un-used valour of a nose" with repellent consequences (Jonson *Poems* 55). Instead of the discursive scalpel or pen, which figured prominently in Chapter One of this study, the nose became the satyr-anatomist's nasal rapier for the anatomy of stench. As John Davies of Hereford explained in *Humours Heau'n on Earth* [1605], "This Nosus[25] [nose] was a true Anatomie / Though Thanatus[26] [death] be truely call'd the same"(*HH* 40); the nose was the anatomist's instrument and macabre "Noyse was [his] Guide" (Dekker *Non Dram Wks III*: 36).

By the same token, however, the nose was a paradoxical sense organ -- vigilant guardian yet contaminating orifice. Although Robert Burton in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* [1621], referred to the nose as "the weakest sense in men," in plague time, the opposite seemed to be true (*AM Pt 1 Sec 1*: 138). While the healthy proboscis made Londoners acutely aware of noisome places, the nose was often the sufferer's portal of ruination as it discharged the lifeblood of the infected body, as Chapter Three's section on "Pestilential Emissions" argues. In the anatomy, the satyr-anatomist used his nose as both a sense organ and a moral barometer. In keeping with the beastly façade of the satyr, the satyr-anatomist possessed a snout likely reminiscent of the "Puritan nose" Adriana spoke of in Barry Lo's *Ram-Alley or Merrie-Trickes* [1611] (Lo B1) -- a "very sharpe and long" nose, able to detect the corrupting taint of moral transgressions -- a nose capable of dissecting "what rotten stenches, and contagious damps [that] would strike vp into thy [anatomist's] nosthrils" (*SDS* 47).

---

[25] "Nosus" is an Old English variant form of "nose." See *OED* CD ROM.
[26] In Greek mythology, "Thanatos" [death] was the brother of Hypnos the God of Sleep. Ibid.

As the satirists would note at length, foul smells permeated the Tudor and Stuart urban experience measuring and recording "a life, / So stinkingly depending" (*MM* III ii 26-27) on the interpretation of malodour. With "Smokey Noses, and stinking Nostrils" and often without nosegays, pomanders or pouncet-boxes, the satirical anatomist dissected both urban and civilian body rancidity to bombastic extremes (Rowlands *Comp Wks II*: 22).[27] Of course, dissecting the stench of pestilence must have been a futile project when "their Noses hate[d] the smell," as Edward Hake mentioned (Hake B8). It comes as little surprise, then, that the hatred of human smells fuelled the satirical misanthropy of the anatomy and his burgeoning moral disdain for London. But as the next section will argue, the hatred of smells also produced a hysteria of smells.

---

27 In Spiritvall Preseruatiues against the Pestilence or Seven Lectures on the 91. Psalme [1603], Henry Holland explained the declamatory ambience of the term this way: "The Pestilence is here saide to bee noisome, greiuous, and painefull. The word noysome, or greuious, is in the originally a word of the pl. n. & signifieth griefes. So the plur. n. is vsed for the superlatiue degree . . ." (SPA B 30).

'Pestiferous Miasmata': The Hysteria of Smells

Because of the Neoplatonic nature of the anatomy, the infected city mirrored the infected body – macrocosm and microcosm were, therefore, rarely indistinguishable. London was regularly personified and anatomised through satire. Indeed, the city mourned, bled, stunk and discharged infection just like an infected sufferer did.[28] And, by the same token, the diseased body became a diseased micro city of filth and infection.[29] The medieval elements of the body,[30] for example – earth, air, water, and fire – all figured prominently in the production and sustain of city odour in the Renaissance. Like the fetid stench of the epidemical city, the diseased body produced its own series of miasmatic foulness through the discharging orifices of its semi-cadaverous state as it mirrored its epidemical macrocosm. What was certain was that both the urban stench of epidemic London and its diseased populace had a congealed transhistorical past.

---

[28] William Wharton, in *Whartons Dreame* [1578] personified London, giving the city a sinful urban "body." According to Wharton,

> like as the disease that lyeth ranckling and festering in the heart, ransacking euerie lym and ioynt of the body, and by that meanes makes all the members of the same subiect to his infirmitie. So the couetousnesse of London, the pride of London, the wantonnes of London, the ryotousnes of London, doth poyson the whole Realme of Englande, and maketh it apte to all wickednesse. (Manley 1995: 91)

In a somewhat more demonic, yet anthropomorphic vein, William Bullein's *A Dialogue of the Feuer Pestilence* [1578] depicted early modern London as a "bodie of sinne with many infernall heddes: wickednesse in euery place under the Sonne" (DFP 92). In *London Looke Backe* [1625], Dekker likened the city to a miscarrying mother: "*LONDON was great with childe, and with a fright / Shee fell in labour. — But O pitious sight! / All in her Child-bed Roome did nought but mourne, / For, those who were deliuer'd were still-borne*" (*PPD* 177).

[29] In "XII Meditation" of John Donne's *Devotions*, Donne likened the human body to an urban body: "The heart in that body is the king, and the brain his council; and the whole magistracy, that ties all together, is the sinews which proceed from thence. . ." (Donne *Maj Wks*: 339-40).

Though slightly beyond the Jacobean period, William Kemp echoed the Neoplatonism of the early moderns in *A Brief Treatise of the Nature, Causes, Signes, Preservation From and Cure of The Pestilence* [1665]. Kemp described the infected body thus:

> his flesh like the soft earth, his bones like the hard stones and minerals, his hair like the grasse, the blood in his veins and arteries distributed throughout the whole body, and all meeting in the heart or liver, like the rivers and waters dispersed in the earth, and all meeting in the Sea and Ocean; his breath like the wind, his head like the heavens. (*ABT* 30)

[30] Of the four elements, fire was the only promising constituent as it was used to fumigate the foul air. Air, of course, carried noysome odours and miasmas. Earth or dirt was also blamed for generating miasmas, while London's ditches and even its not-so-fresh water supply, the Thames, carried stench and sewage.

Before London burned in 1666, it had a long recorded history of noisomeness and plague. The recurring "pestiferous miasmata[s]" (Hodges 17) which continued to dominate the early modern experience of epidemic, befouled the atmosphere, making plague a subject of scented enquiry. In the cause of understanding, curing, and ultimately ending plague, these noxious stenches of past and present outbreaks were dissected in a variety of pungently vivid anatomies. From Roman *Londinivm* to Victorian London (when underground sewers and improved sanitation rendered London's air somewhat less offensive), the English capitol had long been rife with foul aromas. London writers from most literary periods have anatomised the malodorous molecules that have permeated the city's polluted air throughout its long history. [31] From Geoffrey Chaucer through Ben Jonson and Sir John Harington to Jonathan Swift, London's rather eclectic stinks inspired many writers to anatomise the city of smells. Within the anatomy, the early modern satirist became a plague-smeller pursiuvant of sorts, reinforcing the popular miasmatic phobias of foul smells; "pestiferous stinks" which were considered invisible poisons. And although Renaissance London had no physician named William Smellie [1697-1763], the city did have available translations of the foul-sounding contemporary natural philosopher,

---

[31] Anatomising stench was not a Renaissance invention, but a tradition began in the ancient world with the miasmatic theories of Galen and Hippocrates, whose works were revived through the humanist forces of the Renaissance. Under humanist influences and the research of natural philosophy, odour perception and interpretation played a formative role in the satirical literature of "the noysome Pestilence." In "a thriving symbolic system of odour" (Classen, Howes and Synott 74), olfactory perception also helped to reinscribe the disgust of pestilential odour. The cultural investment in smells and their relation to disease, especially plague, therefore, is essential to understanding and contextualizing the reception, impact, and attempts to control "the most noysome infection" (Nashe *Wks II*: 139) to strike London. By eliminating sin the satirist argued that "the infected ayre will vncongeale, and the wombes of the contagious Clowdes will be clensed" (Nashe *Wks II*: 163).

Fridericus Nausea,[32] and the published works of the divine, John Philpot,[33] not to mention a host of satirical writers including with suspicious surnames of their own -- like Thomas Bastard and Robert Pricke -- the nasal voyeurs and "bate-breeding sp[ies]" (*VEN* 655) of this smelly urban domain where plague-related odours reigned and "yeeld[ed] a loathsome, stifling smell" (*BRI*: 227).

The planting of paranoid fears in an already hysteric public was the anatomical terrain of London's hacks, bards, physicians, and those in between: the "sour informers" and dissectors of pestilential odours; writers whose own creative process was uniquely influenced by the "sense-confounding wretchednesse" of epidemical London (Tourneur *Wks*: 66). As they sought to determine and explain the cause and origin of plague, writers dissected a variety of plague associated odours on topics ranging from toilets to tobacco. In *Sylva Sylvarum* [1627], for example, Sir Francis Bacon considered the stench of the prison to be the most dangerous infection after the plague (Corbin 86). Sir John Harington's anatomy of the privy, *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* [1596], dissected London's "hatefull hellish properties, [of] smoke, [and] stinke" that were produced not only by human waste but wasting humans (*MOA* 149). Also likely inspired by the olfactoral debate over stench, the monarch, James I, got involved in the deliberations. In his tract *A Counterblaste to Tobacco* [1604], however, the somewhat out-of-touch monarch was more concerned with the "stinking fume" of tobacco smoke than the stench of pestilence, which was somewhat surprising as it was a popular early modern belief that tobacco was a preventive antidote for plague (James I 1604: 107).[34]

---

[32] The right reuerend Fridericus Nausea was the Bishop of Vienna. His tract, *Of all blasing stars in generall* [1578] was translated by A. Fleming and appeared in London in 1578.

[33] John Philpot was the author of *The examinacion of the Constaunt martir of Christ J*. [1556.] As noted in Chapter One, Philpot has a smelly scatological resonance since "philpot" in the early modern period meant "overfull chamber pot." See James T. Henke's *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays Vol. 2*, 229.

While optimistic chroniclers of London, such as the antiquary William Camden (*Brittania* [1586]); the topographer William Harrison (*The Description of England* [1587]); the cartographer John Speed (*The History of Great Britain* [1604]); and the antiquary John Stow (*A Survey of London* [1598]), all, with, of course, the odd exception, exalted the genealogies, splendours and triumphs of the city, the pessimistic satirical anatomists focused solely on the sins and tragedies of epidemic. There was no glory among the gore, however, for the cynical anatomists who forcefully argued the urban filth of the city was indicative of London's moral filth, the "defilements and pollutions" (Nashe *Wks II*: 22) of city sins that even clogged the Lord's nostrils as Robert Wright maintained in *A Receyt to Stay the Plagve* [1630].[35] Dissecting a combination of physical and moral pollution, anatomising writers like John Davies of Hereford, in *The Triumph of Death* [1605], for example, referred to London as a giant sewer or a "sincke of Sinne" (*TD* 232). For Robert Greene, London resembled "a melancholy dump" (Greene *Comp Wks I*: ii), whereas, for Sir Philip Sidney, London was simply part of "this world's dunghill" (*AAP* 116). As the anatomy argued, the city's "stincking doonghils, filthie and standing pooles of water," all provided a wealth of fetid molecules which made London a disgustingly aromatic city in and out of plague (*ADP* B1).

The history and literature of the Renaissance informs us that few great European cities rivalled early modern London for its wealth, trade, epidemics, filth and its manifold stench.[36] If Lear's Gloucester could "smell / his way to Dover," any early moderner could have surely sniffed his or her way to London (*KL* III vii 93). Unpleasant odours had to be tolerated when puddle-jumping the basest filth or "mudde that r[an] in the channell[s]" of London's stinking streets and alleys (*EMO* II ii 3860). With his feet "locked in the myre of pollution," the satirist used the discourse of physical filth to anatomise the moral qualities of foul smells (Nashe *Wks II*: 153). There was little denying that the "odiferous stench" of this noble, yet filthy city was unrelentingly omnipresent, making it the subject of intolerance and disgust in the print culture (*JN* III iv 26). And although we postmoderns can only reimagine what the pungent olfactoral experience of a Renaissance city was like, the anatomy offers us a wealth of dissective evidence portraying the stenchful aesthetic of early modern London in time of plague.

---

[34] Harold Priestly notes that: "The in(haling of tobacco was recommended because it drew the purifying smoke down into the lungs" (Priestly 106). See also Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 35.

[35] According to Robert Wright, it was the stench of sin, "the wicked thoughts of our hearts, and the vncleane actions of our liues, which yeeld an vnsauory smell in the nosthrils of the Lord are sweetned by no other meanes, but the Incense of our prayers" (Wright 1630: 10).

In epidemic London, the smells of stinking life and putrid death must have been overpowering and unavoidable. Although most inhabitants would have adhered to Thomas Thayre's and William Boghurst's preventative advice to -- "auoyd all noysome and vnsauory places" (*ATP* D2 & *LGP* 55) whenever they could -- with some six million olfactory receptors in each nostril , however, escaping the malodorous scents of London would only have been achieved by fleeing the city (Engen 4). By all accounts, those who could afford to leave the ill-smelling city did so. For those compelled to remain in the London during epidemics either out of obligation, necessity, or circumstance, these "abandoned" Londoners confronted a barrage of foul and deathly odours such as "Priuies, filthie houses, [and] gutter chanilles, [that were] uncleane kept" (*DFP* 43). In addition to the open sewers and inadequate sanitation, life in the overcrowded and unhygenic city was made especially malodorous with the accumulated noxiousness of sickness and mass mortality. "The great store of rotten and stincking bodies" from epidemic unquestionably added a particular pungence to the already reeking city (*ADP* B2). What was certain was that London streets weren't paved with gold but rather, dung, dirt and cadavers, where "their withered dead-bodies serue[d] to mende High-waies with" (Nashe *Wks II*: 59).

---

[36] Nashe, Dekker, and Jonson seemed to have followed the empirical lead of the French writer Thouret who said:

> One has to traverse those places of infection to know what those residues or products that can be called the excrement of a great city really are and to understand what the immeasurable increase in uncleanliness, stench, and corruption that results from the proximity of men really looks like. (Corbin 31-2).

In some cases, London's more infamous roads were tarred with unbecoming epithets reflecting the moral and physical disgust they produced. John Stow's *A Survey of London* [1598], charted a number of reeking city arteries such as "Foule Lane,"[37] "Stinking Lane,"[38] "Gutter Lane,"[39] "Sprinckle Alley"[40] and "Grub Street."[41] Other chroniclers also mention the "slippery ground" (*PPD* 39) of "Pissing Lane, Stynkyng Alley, Shiteburnlane," and "Dunghill Lane," which left little to the imagination.[42] In addition to the dirty ground, London had to confront its "filthy Thames water"[43] (Nashe *Comp Wks I*: 173), and other polluted strips of water like "Houndsditch," so named, because the putrid pond fouled the air with the scent of decaying domestic animals that had been tossed into it.[44] Another foul body of London water would have to include the urinary ambience of Puddle Wharfe.[45]

---

[37] See Eilert. Ekwall's *Street-Names of the City of London*, 101.

[38] Ibid, 101.

[39] Ibid., 127.

[40] On Sprinckle Alley more than just "holy water" trickled on the ground. See Henry Harbin's *A Dictionary of London*, 543.

[41] Ibid., 85-86.

[42] See Eilert Ekwall's *Street-Names of the City of London*, 103.

[43] In the anonymous play *Nobody and Somebody*, Nobody offered an insight into the smell and taste of Thames water. "I thank you sir, and were your beer Thames water, / Yet Nobody would pledge you. To you, sir" (V 1119-1170).

[44] See Al Smith's *Dictionary of London Street Names*, 104.

[45] Stowe described "Puddle Wharfe" as "a water gate into the Thames" where "trampeling" horses making "puddle[s]" befouled the slough near the smelly Brewhouse. See John Stow's *A Survey of London by John Stow. Vol. II*, 11 & 13.

There was also the moral stench of "Stew Lane, Stew Alley Stairs,"[46] "Cod Piece Alley, Gropecuntlane, and Whores Lie Down,"[47] to contend with – "streets desperate of shame" (*JN* V I 64), scented with the sinful stenches of drunkards,[48] "kennel nymphs,"[49] "Winchester geese" (Partridge 219), whorehounds and sodomites[50] consumed in "the mire of filthie pleasures and delight" -- living loosely in what the satirist defined as the Epicurean excesses of Renaissance London (*CSC* 160). These were shameful titles for shameless stretches of foul roads in a filthy city; names which crudely underlined the prophane state of the city and the aromatic sins that flowed from them.

The polluting presence of sin and sinners provided a redolent source for satirical abuse. In *Of the duetie of a faithfull and wise Magistrate* [1583], John Ewich complained,

> The streetes, and allies, yea and the Church yards also, euerie where in some places so defiled with ye doung of shamelesse Roges and Beggars, that which

---

[46] See Al Smith's *Dictionary of London Street Names*, 104 & Henry Harbin's *A Dictionary of London*, 543.

[47] See E.J. Burford's *The Orrible Sin: A Look at London Lechery from Roman to Cromwellian Times*, 151.

[48] Keith Thomas notes that "drunkenness" was the sin that brought plague into a small Kentish town. As Thomas notes, "When a hundred and ninety persons died of the plague at Cranbrook, Kent, in 1597-8, the vicar of St. Dunstan's church entered his diagnosis in the parish register: it was a divine judgement for the town's sins, and in particular for 'that vice of drunkennes which did abound here'." See *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, 86.

[49] "Kennel nymphs" were "girl[s] of the street." See *OED Vol. VII*, 386.

[50] There appears to be a parallel of the early modern crisis of plague and our own crisis of AIDS that might be described as a "homophobic" link. Where the religious right of the late-twentieth century blames homosexuals and sodomy for AIDS, the early modern satirist also cited sodomy as one of the sins that brought plague upon London. A few examples of anti-sodomy rhetoric in plague discourse include: Thomas Nashe's *Christes Teares Over Jerusalem* [1593], where Nashe lumps London, Jerusalem and Sodom together: "Jerusalem, Sodome, and thou [London], shall sit downe and weepe together" (Nashe *Wks II*: 108); William Muggins' *Londons Mourning Garment or Funerall Teares* [1603] in which Muggins likens the suburbs of London to Sodom: "Like wicked Sodome doth my Subburbs lye / A mighty blemish, to faire Londons eye" (*LMG* D2); *The Triumph of Death* [1605], where Davies speaks "Of Zodomy, that euer-crying sinne" (*TD* 226); Thomas Dekker's *Newes from Graues-end* addressed sins as the cause of plague by stating "Of Vsury shee'll rob the Iewes, / Of Luxury, *Venetian* Stewes / With Spaniards, shee's an Indianist, / With barbarous Turks a Sodomist" (*PPD* 87); *The Thvnderbolt of Gods Wrath* [1618], wherein Edmund Rudierd's "Chapter XVIII" attacks "effeminate persons, Sodomites, and such like monstrous beasts" (Rudierd 42); and the anonymous ballad, *The red-crosse: or, England's lord have mercy upon vs* [1625], which declared that "London is situated as pleasantly as Sodom, and her sister Cities before they sunke" (Red Cross 1).

> so euer your turne your self (with reuerence bee it spoken) you will thinke you see not a publike and commendable way in the Citie, but a vile and beastlye Jakes. (Ewich 36B)

While Ewich's tract reduced London to a giant privy, the smells he anatomised were dissected more for their "defiling" moral properties than for their empirical qualities. In *The Malcontent* [1604], John Marston's "Malevole" expressed similar Ewichian sentiments but with more severe religious implications. As Malevole put it: "I ha' seen a sumptuous steeple turned to a stinking privy; more beastly, the sacredest place made a dog's kennel; nay, most inhuman, the stoned coffins of long-dead Christians burst up and made hog's troughs. *Hic finis Priami*" (*MAL* II v 127-130). Whether religious writer or Jacobean dramatist, the satirical anatomist dissected smells in a distinctly Christian moral character.[51]

Like Marston, London satirists were harshly unforgiving when anatomising the stinks of London because brutishness was part of their rough persona. In any case, we do not have to accept opinionated satirical accounts to verify the stenchful filth of London. For a more unbiased overview of early modern London, we can exhume the thoughts of the observant French Ambassador, Philip Hoby, who was visiting sixteenth-century London on official business. Somewhat like the satirist, Hoby also described the "stinking city" of London as "the filthiest in the world," and "one of the most subject to plague."[52] As Hoby's objective, albeit aversive, observations implied, the filthy urban body of London was considered complicit in breeding and sustaining the pestilential contagion. The Parisian physician, Angelus

---

[51] If we compare Marston's satirical view of the city with William Camden, for example, we get a strong sense of the polemics between the besmearing satirist and the gilding chronicler. According to Camden late-sixteenth-century London was "so adorned everywhere with churches, that religion and godliness seem to have made a choice of their residence therein" (Manley 35) – a radical departure from the satirical city of "dreadful visitations."

[52] Philip Hoby cited in Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 145.

Sala, in 1617, summed up the situation thus: "nothing in the world so drawes downe the plague as illnesse and stinke."[53] For the French eyewitnesses Sala and Hoby, illness and stink were inextricably linked and both were contributing factors of epidemics whether in England or France. Like the French observers, London's satirical anatomists dissected and classified the stench of epidemic with their noses but in a more pronounced moral fashion. Although the satirical nose was sensitive to the smells of pestilence it was equally perceptive to the stinks of the impoverished, yet another collective blamed for spreading plague.

The Malthusian Odour of Infectious Poverty

Owing to the increased mortality rates in the poorest parishes, it followed that the foul-smelling poor were the most vulnerable to the miasmatic force of plague. The stench and filth that accompanied destitution both bred and sustained epidemic disease and the poor remained targets of abuse for assumedly disseminating plague: a population "Unapt for tender smell, or speedy flight" (*RL* 695). If the meek were someday going to inherit this foul piece of bleeding earth, they were going to need potent nosegays.

While the deepest loathings of smells emanated from the plague body, the uninfected body was not above reproach. The inattentiveness to hygiene and sanitation mirrored the filth of the average early modern Londoner. Even the healthy body emitted foul odour[54] in an age where hygiene was primitive to say the least.

---

[53] Angelus Sala's Traité de la peste [1617] cited in Annick Le Guérer's *Scent: The Mysterious and Essential Powers of Smell*, 31.

[54] For George Gascoigne the stench of the healthy was not owing to lack of soap, but rather, from "the fervent heate of lust in the loathsomed stinck of desyre" (Gascoigne *Comp Wks III*: 217).

The poor, of course, smelled the worse, because "Soap, a taxed luxury for the rich," as Andrew Nikiforuk notes, "remained about as common as comets for the poor until the nineteenth century" (Nikiforuk 34). Having said that, however, poor hygiene was not necessarily considered a transgression of social decorum because a layer of filth, or so it was believed, could also possibly prevent infection.[55] In any case, survival, not cleanliness, was on the top of one's list during epidemics. Cleanliness next to Godliness was a concept yet to be born, but the anatomy of body odour was an ancient one going as far back as Aristotle's *Problemata*.[56]

Foul smells were part of the normal course of experience in the Renaissance city. Granted, "noysome" odours did grow more volatile in the poorer parts of the city. The poor sanitation and overcrowding of London's poorer areas, like the fetid "Rotten Rowe," John Stowe mentioned in *A Survey of London* [1603], for example, often smelled the worse for obvious reasons: abject destitution.[57] Stephen Bradwell and other medical writers also noted in grim detail,[58] the great unwashed and the "penny stinkards" were the smelliest urban inhabitants subsisting at ground zero of epidemic in utter squalor (Dekker *Non Dram Wks IV*: 96).[59]

---

55 Richard Sennett notes that "country people," for example, "believed that one should not wash too often. . . because of the crust of dried faeces and urine formed part of the body" (Sennett 262).

56 See Classen, Howes and Synott's *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell*, 30.

57 In *A Survey of London*, Stowe described "these houses for want of reparations in few yeares were so decayed, that it was called Rotten Rowe, and the poore worne out (for there came no new in their place" (Stowe 74).

58 In *Watch-Man for the Pest* [1625], Bradwell described the plight of London's impoverished this way:

> Poore People, (by reason of their great want) living sluttishly, feeding nastily on offals, or the worst & vnwholsomest meates; and many times too long lacking food altogether; haue both their bodies much corrupted, and then Spirits exceedingly weakened: whereby they become (of all others) most subiect to this Sicknesse. And therefore we see the Plague sweeps vp such people in greatest heapes. (*WMP* 46)

59 The following description of Katherine Wheel Alley in Thames street provides an illustrative example of the social conditions of the poor. Written in 1584, the author claimed: "The waie and passage of the same alley so streighted, as that two persons canne hardly passe th'one by the other whereby the Aire is greatelie pestered, which may breede daunger in the tyme of Infeccion. The poore tenementes beinge highlie rented, receaue many Inmates and other base and poore people of badd condicions to the great trouble and annoiaunce of the honest neighbours that inhabite there and the whole warde who haue made very earnest and importune sute for reformacion of the said alley by pluckinge down such unnecessary buildinges" (Archer 81).

Within the olfactoral sphere of the anatomy, then, the stench of plague and the odour of poverty were not too far removed from one another. After all, the impoverished, as an urban group, experienced the highest mortality rates; a likely reason why the "poore Staruelings" (*MC* 118) "living sluttishly" were frequently blamed for plague (*WMP* 46).[60] As *The red-crosse: or, England's lord have mercy upon vs* [1625] put it, there was a certain "comtempt of the poore" (Red Cross 1) in early modern London. In *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence* [1578], Bullein put a more positive spin on this contempt, explaining plague as a kind of macabre comfort: "If such plague doe ensue it is no great losse. For, firste, it shall not onely deliuer the miserable poore man, woman, and bairnes from hurte and carefulnesse into a better warlde" (*DFP* 9). In a somewhat similar spirit, Dekker and Thomson explained how some Londoners envisioned plague as a "depopulating and depauperating" (*LPA* A3) proto-Malthusian check on the poor who grew too foul and abundant. According to *A Rod for Runawaies* [1625] "the Pestilence serue[d] but as a Broome, to sweep Kingdomes of people, when they grow ranke and too full" (*PPD* 142-43). The anatomy emphasized that the "naked, poore, and bare, / Full of diseases, impotent and lame" (Lanyer 109) those who, "in a street liue[d] poore and lowsily" were the noisome targets for blame (Lo H3). In keeping with the inconsistencies and contradictions of the satirical mode, and much to their credit, a number of satyr-anatomists, including Nashe and Wither, made a point of condemning the lack of charity towards the poor as a cause of plague itself because avarice too, stunk in its own way.[61] Nevertheless, the repulsive stench of infectious poverty paled in comparision to the malodorous aura of the plague sufferer.

---

[60] See Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 305-06.

[61] "The Plague of God," wrote Nashe, threatens to shorten both them and theyr children, because they shorten theyr hands from the poore. To no cause referre I this present mortality but to couetise" (Nashe *Wks II*: 163). During the plague of 1625, Wither too, spoke of the "Vnpitied at thy Dores, the poor are crying" (*BRII*: 422).

Pestilent Airs With Flavours to Repulse': The Toxic Interplay of Stench

Having set out the aromatic vices of plaguy London and its inhabitants as a moral barometer, I now turn towards the paranoid and perspiring sufferers of infection: the noysome discharging bodies of plague. For within the odiferous interplay of the macrocosm, the infected body emitted its own noysome toxins where healthy bodies might very likely ingest them. The toxic fumes of the infected had their sources from where, as Thomas Lodge explained, "defluxion is expelled" (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 25). Of the infectious effluvium "expelled," foul breath, sweat, and urine were the most threatening stenches discharged into the atmosphere.

If the average Londoner smelled bad, the plague victim, most certainly, smelled far worse. In *Newes from Graues-Ende* [1604], Dekker likened the body odour of the infected to "mustie bodies putrifying" (*PPD* 72). Though we are inclined to treat Dekker's moldy and rotten description of the decaying sufferer with suspicion, his observations were, however, reiterated by the somewhat more empirical Restoration physician, Nathaniel Hodges. According to Hodges, the presence of a plague sufferer during the Great Plague could "strike the nose like the stench of a rotton carcase" (Hodges 27). In a similar vein, Daniel Defoe wrote in *A Journal of the Plague Year* [1721] that infected bodies "were in themselves but walking putrified Carcasses, whose Breath was infectious, and their Sweat Poison" (Defoe 202). As Defoe and Dekker intimated, the anatomy was about vivisection -- the discursive examination of living cadavers -- putrid vessels emitting contaminating fluids and macabre odours. In the rigours of illness, then, the plague body was not an object of pity but humiliation: a decaying body composed of "rotten flesh" (*AMS*

D3).

The foul smells discharged by the plague subject were not only considered offensive to the nose, but perilous to public health. While James Balmford's *A short dialogue concerning the plagues infection* [1603], argued that faith in God offered immunity from infectious emissions,[62] (despite the fact that the pious were dying alongside the sinful), the satirical anatomy generally promoted contaminating conceptions of noisome effluvia from which no one was safe: the pestilential emissions of sin. In medieval times, the infected body was considered so dangerously infectious, in fact, that an Italian theologian of the thirteenth century, St. Bonaventure, maintained that "the pestilential odour of the body of a single damned sinner would infect the whole earth."[63] Though an extreme statement even by early modern satirical standards, the venting spleen of St. Bonaventure resurfaced occasionally within the anatomy of odour, as the satirist denounced foul smells and foul sins in the same noseholding breath. The self-deprecating John Norden also acknowledged in *A Sinfvll Mans Solace* [1585]: "like stinking filthie cloath / my life appeare to thee," all sins of the flesh stunk (Norden 36).

What did not escape the infected body as laudable pus vented through the pores of the blistered flesh. The plague body, by all satirical and most medical accounts, perspired profusely -- it was a "stincking prison" (*CSC* 326) -- a miasma generating body "breaking forth with stinking sweat" (*ATP* F3 & *DFP* 38); the byproduct of heat within the body during "this hot and contagious time" (*ATP* D2).

---

[62] Balmford's *A short dialogue* [1603], consists of a dialogue between a preacher and a professor. The professor, however, sounds suspiciously orthodox as he denied any of the secular conceptions that suggest the notion of "natural" contagion. As the professor maintained:

> I haue lyen in bed with many that haue had the plague-sores running on them, I haue bene still about them, when they swet, their sores brake, and breath went out of their bodies, and yet I (and a great number besides me, who haue done as much) had neuer the plague yet, and trust neuer shal, so long as I haue a strong faith in God. (Balmford 1603: 44-5)

[63] St. Bonaventure cited in Richard Cavendish's *Visions of Heaven and Hell*, 117.

Henry Holland explained the plight of the infected by suggesting that "euerie hot disease (as the Plague) [wa]s more dangerous and grieuous in hot times then in colde" (*SPA* 17). For Holland and many others, plague was a temperature raising disease which struck in temperate weather. A hot disease in a warm climate, thus made for sweaty bodies as the anatomy of the "hotspurd plague" explicitly registered (*UFT* 83).

In the throws of "hot" infection brought on by sin, the plague body often resembled moistened tinder. Indeed, plague "left the whole body," according to Thomas Adams' *Englands Sicknes*, [1615] "as it were a burning pyle" (*ES* 80). For the more religious leaning anatomists like Thomas Fuller, the infected body seemed to boil at a hellish temperature within "the flames of pestilent and hot diseases" (Fuller 52). Such was the Faustian dilemma[64] sufferers confronted in vice-ridden London during "The *Horror* of a *Plague*, the *Hell*" (*PPD* 82). Similarly, the preacher, William Cupper, likened the forces upon the perspiring and fevered body to "the heate of persecution" (*CSC* 160) from which sufferers literally burned, "as oyle and flame put together" (*WMP* 46). "Some Christians understand," wrote Henoch Clapham, "when they say, that the Pestilence is as a Candle, and bodies as strawe, some wet, some dry, more or less capable of taking fire" (Clapham 1603: A5). Whether hellish or biological, sacred or secular, the high fevers discharged a residue of "filthy froth" (Milton B1) discharging infectious miasma in the process.

For anatomists with more secular inclinations, the plague body envelope perspired profusely on account of the high fever of infection. Stephen Bradwell explained that the infected body teemed with contaminating discharges emitted through the bodily pores, an infectious reaction which the physician defined as "the transpiration of the excrements" (*WMP* 46). Through a lethal combination of "excrementitious iuices, & much heat withall," the body sweltered and emitted an "abhominable savour" through its overworked sweat glands (Ibid. 46 & 43). George Donne elucidated in *The signes that doe declare a person to be infected with the pestilence* [1625] that the plague subject inhabited a "sowre and stinking" (*SIP* 1), and most importantly, a contaminating body which discharged the stenchfull "sharpnesse of hotte and burnyng humours" (*DFP* 45). While the anatomy offered both secular and sacred explanations for the "stinking sweat" of infection, both dissective positions agreed that the feverish plague body emitted a toxic scent through its perspiring flesh. Contact with such contamination, warned many satirists, could have lethal consequences.

---

[64] The satirical anatomy dissected a city, London, that was both hot like hell and full of sinners destined for hell – the Mephistophelian environs Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* [1589] inhabited – "Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscribed / In one self place; but where we are is hell, / And where hell is, there we ever be" (DF II ii 119-121).

But the stench of infectious sweat was not the satirist's only anatomical concern. Within the smelly volley of the anatomy, bodily odours of plague victims did battle with the collective stench of London. The macrocosmic "stench, rottennesse, and unpurenesse of the ayre" John Ewich complained of in *Of the duetie of a faithfull and wise Magistrate* [1583] was often similar to the microcosmic odours found in the infected body (Ewich 21A). It seemed that the infected body absorbed malodour through its proximity to urban odor and recycled that foulness through its sinful composition. The "great stench" (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 21) of the infected body, with its "small guts being much distended with a venemous flatus" (*LPA* 72) along with its "Much belching and windyness" (*LGP* 19), emitted a virtual niagara of effluvium from mouth, sores and genitals, and to a considerable degree, as Lodge suggested, from the windy anus.

Among other bodily vapours, infected "pisse" was another pathogenic phobia of epidemic. Though urinary stench was a concern of the piss prophets – those who made their livelihood from water casting – the "taynting" force of "urine" was also a concern of the anatomist, as Harington fluidly demonstrated in *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* [1596] (*MOA* 193). Paracelsus, of course, wrote on the virtues of healthy human urine and faeces, but even he failed to mention how to respond to infected "water." Within the satirical anatomy, any ambiguity was, however, dissolved. Urinous vapours of the diseased body were to be avoided, especially urine that was, as Bullein's Medicus maintained, "somwhat watrie and sometyme thick with stincke" (*DFP* 38). The contaminating force of infectious urine transcended the privy and possibly even leeched into the print medium itself.

As this is a literary study, it is worth mentioning, as a brief aside, that, for both writers and readers, epidemics generated yet another unexpected vector of transmission: reading. Urine, as Bruce Boehrer notes, was "the signature odour of the printing house,"[65] and with the printers' urine contaminating each page, an infected printer could make for potentially lethal reading, within, of course, the elucidations of the satirical anatomy. On this point, some medical cures might have also been suspect since a number of plague prescriptions, as discussed in Chapter Two, contained human urine. It seemed Shakespeare was not apparently exaggerating in *Hamlet* when he wrote: "Diseases desperate grown / By desperate appliance are reliev'd, / Or not at all" (*HAM* IV iii 9-10).

Shifting our attentions from the "venemous flatus" of the small guts and the "taynting urine" of the bladder, we now venture into one of the more noxious body emissions propelled not from a natural sphincter, but the miasmatic discharges from the plague "scabs and sores most noysome" (*SPA* 34). Whenever plague sores erupted on the body, these "putrifying sores" (*DOS* 2) were capable of discharging toxic effluvia. As B.L.'s Job-sounding narrator confessed: "My wounds stincke, and are corrupt through my foolishness" (B.L. D3), these festering sores had their own "uile stinking sauour" (*ADP* 16). By most satirical accounts, the reaction between body febrility and interior corruption produced a putrid fume from its fiery interior. Like the infected macrocosm, the body too, "Exhale[d] out filthy smoke and stinking steames" of contagion (Hall *Coll Poems*: 14) .

---

[65] Bruce Boehrer's insights into the Renaissance printing house are worth noting here. As Boehrer states:

> At least once – often twice a day, the printers unbound the leather balls that they used to ink their presses, and, in order to keep the leather supple, they soaked it in open bowls of their own stale. The ink balls, thus permeated with the printers' urine, must have introduced some minute chemical residue of the digestive tract into the ink absorbed by the paper of [Ben] Jonson's books. (Boehrer 2)

As we have witnessed throughout this study, the legitimate anatomists often supported satirical hypotheses and vice versa, and the conception of a burning body was no exception. Thomas Lodge, for example, was both a physician and satirical writer, who likened the plague body to a burning building that could only be extinguished with much water (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 79) because, as William Kemp added, "The Plague is a Fire that is not easily quenched" (*ABT* A2). While Lodge employed Neoplatonism to fashion his analogous infected body-as-house notion, other satirical writers preferred to keep the body within the sphere of fevered corporeality. Neoplatonism was more a resonant element than a systematic dissection for writers like William Perkins, who, for example, took the term "burning feaver" to its most literal extremes (*ASF* 16). The incendiary metaphor was part of the logic of the anatomy that dissected infected "inward parts burning hot" (I.W. B2) and "veines . . . full of burning" (*CSC* 6). "The fire of the present plague" (J.D 12) ignited sinners, setting "their bloud on fire" (*ES* 80). If the plague body was "fewel for fier," and chafed by sin, it was reasonable to assume that it would inevitably let off noxious steam or smoke from sores that billowed like weeping flues (Gascoigne *Comp Wks III*: 218).

Stephen Bradwell said of the carbuncle: "It is wonderfull angry, and furiously enflaming, as if a quicke coale of fire were held to the place: when it hath his name Carbunculus, a little coal of fire" (*WMP* 51), the severe abscess was by name and by métier, a suppurating hunk of burning flesh, much in the way that Fluellen described Bardolph in *Henry V* [1599].[66] Simon Kellwaye added that the "great burning and pricking pain" of these "diuers Pustules" (*ADP* 35) emitted airy matter as well. The conceptual "reek of smoke" from plague sores that were "venemous and corrupteth the air,"[67] was not, however, a newfangled notion. The earliest English account of plague, the *Little Book of 1486*, argued that the infected body did just that. In *Meditations XII*, for example, John Donne similarly envisioned the body as "the oven that spits out this fiery smoke," but whatever caloric parallel the satirist drew, the searing body interior produced most noisome and sometimes "smoky" emissions (Donne *Maj Wks*: 339).

Through the reaction of heat and interior corruption, the "hotte and burnyng humours" mingled with the brimstone fetor of sins (*DFP* 45). This noxious agglomeration, as the anatomy exhibited, eventually exited the body surface through erupting plague sores in an infectious billow of condensed smog and venomous pollution. The satyr-anatomists warned that the stench was not only foul, but caustic and lethally infectious to those who confronted it. Yet as hazardous as the effluvium of sores was, however, the most threatening of the body's miasmatic discharges was infectious respiration.

In the anatomy, infected bodies were typically figured as "noysome Beasts," but the most caustic effluent they expelled was chronic or perhaps demonic halitosis (Rous 1623: 52-3). Among the other urban stinks, plague and bad breath were also inextricably linked in epidemical London. Wither explained the foul nexus this way: "Our bodies infected; and our breath" (*BRI*: 218). For the anatomy disease and rank breath were notoriously synonymous. "Of all morbid emanations," discharged from the plague body, therefore, as Annick Le Guérer argues, "the breath was the most terrifying" (Le Guérer 45). It was "The inavoidable stench of their strong breath," wrote Dekker, that generated fear in the anatomist who instilled this fear in his daunting reader (*PPD* 72). From "corrupted mouthes" (*DFP* 38) – "sowre and stinking" (*SIP* 1) – half-full of "teth stinkyng and blacke" (*DFP* 132), the plague body exhaled contaminating infection with each "vile and noysome" laboured "breath" (*WMP* 43). The infected sufferer experienced not only "shortnes of breath," (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 21) "and difficulty in breathing" (I.W. B2), but, explained Thomas Lodge, "great stench of the same" (Lodge *Comp Wks IV*: 21). Through "breath thick and short" (*ADP* 16), the infected mouth became an ejecting fumarole for spit and vomit but especially for the telling and "stinking exhalations" (*UFT* 83).

---

[66] Fluellen's diagnosis of Bardolph is crude but vividly telling: "His face is all bubukles, and whelks, and knobs, and flames a' fire, and his lips blows at his nose, and it is like a coal of fire, sometimes plue and sometimes red" (*H5* III vi 102- 105).

[67] *The Little Book* cited in Paul Slack's *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*, 27.

The sufferer's miasmatic breath, like the malodorous taint of the city, was an invisible toxin, detectable only through scent. As foul-smelling as the macrocosm might have been, however, the breath of the infected transcended any urban stench imaginable. Donne's leading question from *Meditations XII* structured the foul enigma this way: "What ill air that I could have met in the street, what channel, what shambles, what dunghill, what vault could have hurt me so much as these home bred vapours?" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 340). For Donne, it was the stench within the body that was most toxic and most foul. These were the "vapoured syghes" that "dymme[d] the ayre" (Gorges 4) Sir Arthur Gorges spoke of, and to which Dekker added, "In flakes of poyson drop[ped] on all" exposed to them (*PPD* 83).

Without question, the "leprous harlots breath" (Donne *Maj Wks*: 21) Donne condemned in "Elegy 6: The Perfume" and the "stinking breath" of Robert

Herrick's "Free Maid, with Foule Breath" were no match for the putridity of the plague body's "home bred vapours" (Herrick *Poe Wks*: 210). For Donne and other satirists, the body's intrinsic corruption was another source of plague, a hopeless sin-born enemy subverting health from within, much like the malignant expiration Spenser spoke of in *The Faerie Qyeene* [1596]: "The noysome breath, and poysnous spirit sent / From inward parts, with cancred malice" (*FQ* VIII 26 3-4). As the anatomy elucidated, the infected body a was self-polluting and a self-generating body of sin and putrid decomposition.[68]

Within the satirical scheme, therefore, the body could not simply ingest infection but reproduce it, as Donne and Spenser explicitly contended. Thomas Adams, in *Englands Sicknes* [1615], preferred to explain exhaled miasmata this way : "Some haue been choked vp with the fumes and vapours ascending from their own crude and corrupted stomackes, and poysoned their spirites no lesse then with the contagion of infected ayres" (*ES* 80). According to Adams, corruption from without and corruption from within enabled the body to generate and spread plague miasmatically, similar to the hypothesis suggested by Martin Luther earlier in the sixteenth century. In a slightly more ecclesiastical sense than Adams, Luther's tract, *Whether One May Flee From a Deadly Plague*, claimed that infectious breath was *the* (emphasis mine) vector of transmission. "I am of the opinion," said Luther, "that all the epidemics, like any plague, are spread among the people by evil spirits who poison the air or exhale a pestilential breath which puts a deadly poison into the flesh" (Luther 127). Luther's miasmatic theory found "stincking stale" parallels in the plague discourse of the early moderns, as the elucidations of Adams, Donne, Dekker, Lodge, and Wither confirm; moral parallels that would resonate throughout the seventeenth century (Lodge *Comp Wks III*: 45).[69]

---

[68] Plague bodies were considered living cadavers in the satirical anatomy, it is of little surprise, therefore, that their breath should be so morbidly threatening. Like the stench of death, plague breath was not only offensive but considered infectious.

Luther's muckraking sentiments also found their way into the debate over plaguy breath. The metaphorical and metonymical possibilities of plague breath made the miasma an ideal axiom for a variety of rhetorical ends. In testament to its discursive brawn, the dread of human miasma became an *ad hominem* device for moral and personal criticism. The long-winded Wither, for example, used the pestiferous mofette as the basis for a verbal assault on his critics in *Britains Remembrancer* [1626], while Dekker used infectious breath for social commentary in *Worke For Armourours* [1609].[70] Just as filthy language was indicative of the filth within, or so Edmund Cobbes argued,[71] the satirist directed a series of "mervailous hot breaths" (*UFT* 49) against individual and social adversaries within the "rotten and unsavorie communication" their own imaginations (Cobbes 109).

In this mediating anatomy of stench, writers contributed to the abject construction of the odiferous plague subject. While the satyr-anatomists dissected a plague body that generated and disseminated its own pestilential exhalations, "The noisome breathings of a sickly throng" further corrupted the air of epidemic adding to the collective stench of death and disease (Wither *BRI*: 187). "As I said before," wrote Nashe, "no remedy, or signe of any breath of hope, was left in their Commonwealths sinne-surfetted body," London's collective body of sinners were void of fragrance and full of fetor (Nashe *Wks II*: 20).

---

[69] Later noseholding nosographers who anatomised infectious miasmata, such as physician to King Charles II, Walter Charleton, continued to convey more moral than empirical commentary in their observations. In *Physiologia Epicuro-Gassendo-Charltoniana: Or a fabrick of science natural, upon the hypothesis of atoms* [1654], for example, Charleton described pestilential breath as a noxious discharge from "accursed miscreants, who have kindled most mortal infections, by certain veneficious practices, and compositions of putrid and noysom odours"(Charleton 236).

[70] Although Wither was attacking his "foul-breathed" critics when he spoke of "Breathe ranker poison then a plague fill'd grave" (*BR I*: 578), and Dekker was railing against opportunistic "Huksters or Haglers" "whose breath is stinking in my nosthrils, and able to infect a quarter of the world" (Dekker *Non-Dram Wks IV*: 149), both writers were clearly articlulating the connection between foul breath and infection, for their own rhetorical agendas.

[71] As Cobbes said in *The Parable of the Vncleane Spirit* [1633]: "Doe but consider how much rotten and unsavorie communication proceeds out of our mouth; how much envie and malice boiles in our hearts; doth not this shew, that there is much filthinesse within?" (Cobbes 1633: 109-110).

As this final chapter has argued, the repulsive odours of infection dominated the anatomy. Strong smells were embellished by satyr-anatomists to convey the moral sense of pestilential stench. Mimetic to some degree, however, the noxious essence of sin transcended mere foulness because it carried the scent of moral disgust. Though the satirist argued that the tactics of deodorizing against the foul miasmas were ineffectual, he was, for the most part, right. And though the satirical debate between the exact origins of toxic miasmas remained unsettled, it was agreed that the stench of pestilence was universally lethal and infectious. The foul smells dissected in the anatomy also held the poor in contempt for breeding plague. Convenient scapegoats, the impoverished were indicted by the satyr-anatomist simply because they smelled of "durt" and destitution.

According to the anatomy, it was largely the defiling moral properties of smells that befouled the air of London. Within the anatomy body febrility mingled with the brimstone fetor of sin producing a noxious miasma. Airborne toxins released from the infected body were not only considered malodorous but contaminative. The infected body mirrored the diseased city as the repulsive macro- and microcosmic odours constantly reminded Londoners of death and disease. The stenches of plague were considered invisible poisons, these were real smells with symbolic significance. For the anatomising satirist, then, plague was as much a stench as it was an infectious disease.

Within the gore and stench of the satirical anatomy, London and its inhabitants were held accountable for breeding, sustaining, and promoting plague. In plague time, London was not a sacred but a prophane city – the dystopian capitol of England – the embodiment of all things sinful and diseased. As the anatomy demonstrated, the satyr-anatomists of early modern London considered it their moral duty to promote a contempt and hatred of pestilence. In their attempt to shame Londoners into piety, satirical writers left a legacy of textual artifacts which constitute and convey, as this study has illuminated, the profound and disturbing satiric disgust of plague: a virtual anatomy that articulates the traumatic reality of epidemic.

Conclusion

For the inhabitants and writers of early modern London, epidemics were very real and traumatic social events. As the literature created in time of epidemic demonstrates, plague was a profoundly transformative experience. Throughout the Renaissance, plague remained the providential curse of London and the literary burden of the satirist. In response to the mass mortality, satirical writers recorded a distorted history of plague through the metaphor of the anatomy. By blending the apocalyptic fatalism of Christian myth with historical reality, satirical writers regularly allegorized London and its populace, reducing and debasing the city and its collective to an abject status. The anatomy argued that this despicable culture, this centre of vice and "sincke of Sinne," was deserving of divine wrath because of the wicked indulgences which prevailed throughout the city (*TD* 232). Like the religious reformer, the satirist was concerned with the sins and abuses of London which presumedly brought plague upon the city. The satirist, therefore, attacked both plague and its perceived causes: collective sin and human folly. As the anatomy elucidated, London was a culture of excesses: mass mortality and collective vice. The decadent lives of London's moral transgressors were typically the source blamed for London's recurring visitations, because, as Nashe explained, "Shame, sicknes, [and] misery, followe[d] excesse" (Nashe *Wks III*: 268).

As Nashe intimated in *Summers Last Will and Testament* [1600], the anatomy conveyed that there was, at work, what we might, looking back, call a divine social Darwinism at work. The survival of the morally fittest few was set in stark juxtaposition to the demise of the immoral majority. In a moral sense, the holier-than-thou satirist helped reinforce the traditional links between sin and disease. While in fact, it was, as this study has demonstrated, a complex web of voices. The voices of these satyr-antomists could be varied and contradictory. Rhetorically, satire was used to defend and reaffirm traditional beliefs about plague, but, as we have seen, did so from using various strategies and points of view. Fettered to scriptural interpretations of plague, however, literary representations of disease operated under the assumption that the force of mass mortality was divinely powered, just as it was in the biblical plagues of Egypt and David, and in the classical accounts by Procopius and Thucydides. Led by the logic of divine retribution, or what Northrop Frye refers to as an "undisplaced myth," satirists continued to defend the long-enduring notion[1] of plague as divinely sanctioned, a lethal affliction archetypally defined as the retributive justice of providentialist violence.

Considered a retributive disease, plague was the ideal subject for allegory as Thomas Adams, Thomas Brewer, John Godskall, Thomas Nashe, and many others articulated. A variety of typological associations of pestilence drawn from the Bible were effectively exploited at great length by satyr-anatomists. The anatomy was, of course, both historical and moral allegory -- a threatening *memento mori* of divine wrath -- a cautionary anatomy of fear and intimidation. As Nashe wrote, "theres no such readye waye to make a man a true christian, as to perswade himselfe he is taken up for an anatomie," separating the Christian from the heathen, sickness from health, and sin from sanctity was made possible through the satirical "anatomie" (*UFT* 131). The anatomy was, therefore, as much about divinity as it was about division.

Understandably, the crisis of mass mortality prompted shock, horror, contempt, and blame for an epidemical disease that was grossly misunderstood and misinterpreted as providential scourge. These discursive vivisections exposed, shamed, and humiliated both the healthy and the infected bodies of epidemic in a disciplinary counterblast to the shame and scandal of infection. In its own perverse way, the satirical literature of plague mirrored the mortal violence of epidemic. Abuse and raillery were the anatomy's *raison d'être*. In scathing moral commentary and accusatory rhetoric, the satyr-anatomist attempted to locate and dissect the source of infection through the exegesis of the anatomy. Within the anatomy, the obsessive propensity to vivisect and dehumanize a city both physically and morally polluted, this moral grotesque refashioned a dystopic realm from the foul remnants of its dissective fictions.

---

[1] In postmodern times, the religious right uses similar rhetorical tactics in its anatomy of AIDS. Religious groups such as the Moral Majority locates blame for AIDS in the homosexual community, shaming and blaming homosexuals for the retributive cause and spread of disease. Where the early moderns focused on a variety of sin and vice as the cause of plague, the religious right, however, singles out homosexuals as the cultural scapegoat for AIDS. Though separated by some four centuries, the scapegoating phenomenon still resonates.

Through a series of symbolic vivisections the misanthropic satirists condemned, debased and mocked humanity, blaming collective sin for a variety of urban ills, most prominent of which was plague. In this culture of excrement and disease, sin and pestilence remained London's most befouling forces. These symbolic anatomies reviled sinner and sufferer, as the symbolic filth of the body mirrored the physical pollution of the city. The Neoplatonic impulses of the anatomy were, nevertheless, little more than pseudo-*scientia* combined "with [the] disordred hayle-shotte of Scripture" (Nashe *Comp Wks II*: 124). It was the intention of these didactic vivisections to inspire fear and revulsion by shaming the reader out of complacency and into piety. In spite of the often absurd content of the anatomy, the dissective rhetoric remained fearfully persuasive for a God-fearing Renaissance reader.

The satirical anatomy was both normative and imaginative, factual yet fictional: satirical *scientia*. Through a series of anti-humanist rants, the sacred spiritual body was transformed into the profane baseness of abject corporeality. This misanthropic desacrilizing of the body debased both infected and uninfected bodies. As the anatomy dissected apocalyptic bodies for an apocalyptic era, it exposed bodies tainted with sin and other bodies riddled with "God's Tokens." While the coprophilic gaze of the anatomy fixed upon the uninfected body, for example, it reflected the excremental angst of the satirist. Through a wealth of associations drawn between dung and sin -- the scatological stigmata-- the dirty faecal body was anatomised, its intrinsic foulness and corruption revealed and denounced. And although the healthy body was not infected with plague, it too carried the stench of sin and the dirt of corruption. But it was its unhealthy nemesis -- the plague body -- bedaubed in "sore diseases . . . of long endurance," that was early modern London's most infectious pariah (Warde B1).

An object of loathing, disease, and cultural dread, the plague sufferer was the scapegoat satirical anatomists ultimately indicted for the cause and spread of the recurring pestilential visitations. Through a fulsome vocabulary, the satirist's so-called lexicon of objectification exposed his didactic biases as he reduced the sufferer to a mass of sinful and suppurating flesh. The wretched pathos of the tragic body tapestry reduced the sufferer to little more than a festering and toxic mass of "Burning Feauers, Boyles, Blaines, and Carbuncles" (*PPD* 31). Plague's abject protean qualities supported the concept of the plague body's metamorphosis [2] into a fetid landscape, a grotesque carnal topographic oozing and seething with a contaminating array of running protuberances and miasmatic stinks.

Within the hysteria of the epidemical anatomy, the meta-physiology of diseased bodies was amplified to repellent extremes. By engaging the power of disgust for didactic purposes, these many "informed" opinions on plague, responded with moral emotion[3] more so than reason. For Dekker and many other writers, the "filthie tune" resonating in plague discourse voiced a general euphonic disgust for pestilence (*PPD* 79). Fed up with the dystopian "Citie of Desolation," the contempt and hatred of the diseased city spilled onto its sufferers. Occasionally bordering on the obscene, writers brazenly ignored polite decorum with their repugnant accounts, "Filthing chast ears with their pens" in the process (Guilpin 60). As Nashe warned his audience: "*Sed caueat emptor*, Let the interpreter beware," the dark and disgusting side of plague discourse was not for the timid (Nashe *Wks I*: 155). Instead of consoling their readers, these early modern "paper-blurrers" (*AAP* 132) with their "obscenous, fowle, and scurrill phrases," raised the anxiety levels of the populace by increasing the fear and foreboding of disease (*MOA* 182).

---

[2] Michel Foucault suggests in *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, that "In this corporeal space in which it articulates freely, disease undergoes metastases and metamorphoses. Nothing confines it to a particular course" (Foucault 10-11). In a Foucauldian sense, plague, too, is anarchic and aversively lethal as it also transmogrifies coporeality within the body.

Anatomising the detestable disease was a repugnant, but necessary endeavour. These metaphysical violations transgressed decorum, lacing their invective rants with guilt, indignation and shame. "The fly-bitten tapestries" of vivisected bodies (*2H4* II I 146-47) were intentionally grotesque, amplified and distorted to reinforce the abject nature of the disease in a grotesque aesthetic. The grotesque concept of the body and its repugnant social landscape which typicalizes much plague discourse, first emerged out of the Menippean satire which satirized human folly in both prose and verse. This early modern will to disgust was not simply a grotesque titillation[4] but was invoked by writers and satirists to incite moral revulsion and moral reform in its readership.

This study has collected and reattached the dissective textual remnants of plague satire in order to offer an overview of epidemics in early modern London. As this dissertation has argued, satirical writers responded to the disease through misanthropical invectives which blamed Londoners for their own pestilential undoings. To abate the providential violence of divine "visitations" the satyr-anatomists promoted moral reform by deforming both uninfected and infected grotesque bodies through the shame-based rhetoric of the symbolic anatomy. By disfiguring London and its inhabitants through abjection and humiliation, the Neoplatonic constructs refashioned in the anatomy helped cultivate a phobic hatred and disgust for the disease and its sufferers.

---

[3] Rozin, Haidt, and McCauley's study considers "disgust as a moral emotion." See "Disgust" in *Handbook of Emotions*, 588.

[4] Geoffrey Harpham suggests that 'The grotesque is preeminently the art of disgust." See *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature*, 181.

In reexamining this overlooked tragic dimension of London's cultural and literary history, this study has ventured to fill scholarly gaps in understanding early modern satirical representations of disease. This dissertation has attempted to provide a framework and to further the understanding of, these problematic, and at times absurd, texts by dissecting the deceptive histories of plague satire, a grotesque history distorted through the metaphor of the anatomy and the misanthropical disgust of pestilence in early modern London.

Primary Bibliography

A., I. *A Soveraigne Salue to cure a sick soule, infected with the poyson of sinne*. London: J.A., 1624.

Abbott, Robert. *Bee Thankfull London and her sisters; or, A Sermon of Thankfulnesse*. London: Philemon Stephens and Christopher Meredity, 1626.

Abusivia. *A Looking Glasse for Englande*. London: Henry Car, 1590.

Adams, Thomas. *Englands Sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels*. London: E. Griffin, 1615.

—. *The divells blanket*. London: T. Snodham, 1615.

—. *Diseases of the Sovle: A Discourse Divine, Morall, and Physicall*. London: G. Purslowe, 1616.

Alexander, Sir William. *Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander*. eds. L.E. Kastner and H.B. Charlton. 2 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929.

Anatomy. *The Anathomie of Sinne, Briefely discouering the braunches thereof, with a short method how to detest and auoid it*. London: W. Jaggard, 1603.

Anderson, Anthony. *An Approved Medicine Against the deserued Plague*. London: Thomas Est, 1593.

Andrewes, John. *The Anatomie of Baseness. Or The foure quarters of a Knaue; Flatterie, Ingratitude, Enuie, Detraction*. London: Richard Redmner, 1615.

Anon. *Especiall Obseruations and Approued Physical Rvles; which haue (heretofore) beene well Tryed and Experienced, in the last heauy and grieuous time of the Pestilence*. London: B. Alsop and I. Fawcet, 1625.

—. *Mankynde: A Morality Play Translated from Middle English*. Eds. Janet Dolman and Robert Nunn. Vancouver: Pulp Press, 1977.

—. *Nobody and Somebody*. Ed. David L. Hay. London: Garland Publishing, 1980.

—. *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*. Ed. Jill L. Levenson. New York: Garland Publishing, 1980.

Anton, Robert. *Vices Anotimie, Scovrged and Corrected, in New Satirs*. London: Barnard Alsop, 1617.

Bacon, Sir Francis. *The Essays*. Ed. John Pitcher. London: Penguin Books, 1985.

—. *Francis Bacon: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Baker, Kenneth. *I Have No Gun But I Can Spit: An Anthology of Satirical and Invective Abuse*. London: Methuen, 1980.

Balmford, James. *A short dialogue concerning the plagues infection*. London: Richard Boyle, 1603.

Banister, John. *The Historie of Man, Sucked from the sappe of the most approued Anathomies, in this present age*. London: John Daye, 1578.

Barclay, John. *Euphormio's Satyricon* [1605]. Trans. Paul Turner. London: Golden Cockerel Press, 1954.

Barnes, Barnabe. *The Devil's Charter: A Critical Edition*. Ed. Jim C. Pogue. London: Garland Publishing, 1980.

Bastard, Thomas. *Chrestoleros. Seuen Bookes of Epigrames* [1598]. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

—. *Twelve Sermons*. London: T. Snodham, 1614.

Beard, Thomas. *The Theatre of Gods Iudgements: Or, a Collection of Histories*. London: S.I & M.H., 1597.

Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher. *The Dramatic Works in Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Bede, The Venerable. *Baedae Opera Historica*. Trans. J.E. King. 2 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1930.

Birch, William. *The complaint of a sinner, vexed with paine*. London: A. Lacy, 1563.

Boghurst, William. *Loimographia: An Account of The Great Plague of 1665*. London: Shaw and Sons, 1666.

Boorde, Andrew. *The Breuiary of Helthe, for all maner of sycknesses and diseases*. London: W. Myddelton, 1547.

Boraston, W. *A necessarie and briefe treatise of the contagious disease of the pestilence*. London: T. Fawcet, 1630.

Bownd, Nicholas. *A treatise fvl of Consolation*. London: Cantrell Legge, 1608.

Bradwell, Stephen. *Watch-Man for the Pest*. London: John Dawson, 1625.

Breton, Nicholas. *The Works in Verse and Prose of Nicholas Breton*. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 2 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1966.

—. *Poems by Nicholas Breton*. Ed. Jean Robertson. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1952.

Brewer, Thomas. *The Weeping Lady: Or, London Like Ninivie in Sack-Cloth*. London: B. Alsop, 1625.

—. *Lord have Mercy upon Vs. The World, A Sea, A Pest-house*. London: Henry Gosson, 1636.

Brian, Thomas. *The pisse-pot Prophet, or, Certaine pisse-pot lectures*. London: S.G., 1655.

Bright, Timothy. *A treatise: wherein is declared the sufficiencie of English medicines, for cure of all diseases, cured with medicine*. London: H. Middleton, 1580.

Brugis, Thomas. *The Marrow of Physicke, Or a learned Discourse of the parts of a mans Body*. London: R. Hearne, 1640.

Bullein, William. *Bulleins Bulwarke of Defence againste all Sicknesse, Soarnesse, and Woundes*. London: J. Kyngston, 1562.

—. *A Dialogue against the feuer Pestilence By William Bullein. From the Edition of 1578*. Mark W. Bullen and A.H. Bullen Eds. London: Early English Text Society, 1888.

Bullokar, John. *An English expositor, teaching the interpretation of the hardest words*. London: John Legate, 1616.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Ed. Floyd Dell and Paul Jordan-Smith. New York: Tudor Publishing, 1927.

C., H. *Londons Vacation And The Countries Tearme*. London: Richard Harper, 1637.

C., H. *Londons Lord Have Mercy Vpon Vs*. London: Richard Harper, 1637.

C., R. *The Times Whistle: or Newe Daunce of Seuen Satires, and other Poems* [1615]. Ed. J.M. Cowper. London: Early English Texts Society, 1883.

C., T. *An hospitall for the diseased.* London: T. Mann, 1578.

—. *A Godly and Learned Sermon, Vpon the 91. Psalme. Declaring how, and towhat place, a Christian man ought to flie in the daungerous time of the Pestilence for his best safetie and deliuerance*. London: Edward White, 1603.

Campion, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Campion: Complete Songs, Masques, and Treatises with a Selection of Latin Verse*. Ed. Walter R. Davis. New York: Doubleday, 1967.

Camus, Albert. *The Plague*. Trans. Stuart Gilbert. New York: Penguin, 1960.

Chamberlain, Robert. *Conceits, Clinches, Flashes and Whimzies. Newly studied, with some Collections but those never published before of this kind*. London: R. Hodgkinson,1639.

Chapman, George. *All Fools* [1599]. Ed. Frank Manley. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968.

Charleton, Walter. *Physiologia Epicuro-Gassendo-Charltoniana: Or a fabrick of science natural, upon the hypothesis of atoms [1654]*. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1966.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales*. Ed. N.F. Blake. London: Edward Arnold, 1980.

Church of England. *A Short Forme of Thanksgiuing to God for staying the contagious sickenesse of the Plague*. London: Bonham Norton and John Bill, 1625.

Churchyard, Thomas. *A feast full of sad cheere*. London: J. Charlewood, 1592.

Chytraeus, David. *A soueraigne salue for a sick soule. A treatise teaching the right vse of patient bearing the crosse*. London: R. Field, 1590.

Clapham, Henoch. *An Epistle Discovrsing vpon the present Pestilence*. London: J. Newbery, 1603.

—. *His Demaundes and Answeres touching the Pestilence*. London: 1604.

Clever, W. *The Flower of Physicke*. London: Roger Ward, 1590.

Cobbes, Edmund. *The Parable of the Vncleane Spirit. A worke needful for these secure times, in which the most neglect the meanes of their salvation*. London: T. Cotes, 1633.

Cole, James. *Of Death A Trve Description: And against it A good Preparation: Together with A Sweet Consolation for the suruiuing Mourners*. London: A. Mathews, 1629.

College of Physicians. *Certain Directions For the Plague* [1636]. Amsterdam: Walter J. Johnson, 1979.

Cotgrave, Randle. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* [1611]. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968.

Cotta, John. *A Short Discoverie of the dangers of ignorant practisers of physic*. London: W. Jones and R. Boyle, 1612.

Cowper, William. *The Anatomie of a Christian Man*. London: T. Snodham, 1611.

Crooke, Helkiah. *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man*. London: William Jaggard, 1615.

Cupper, William. *Certaine Sermons Concerning Gods Late visitation in the cite of London and other parts of the land, teaching all men to make vse thereof, that meane to profit by Gods fatherly chastisements*. London: Robert Dexter, 1592.

D, J. *Salomons Pest-Hovse, or Towre-Royall. Newly Re-Edified to preserve Londoners with their Families, and others, from the doubted Deluge of the Plague*. London: T. Harper, 1630.

Daniel, Samuel. *Poems and a Defense of Ryme*. Ed. Arthur Colby Sprague. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Darling, Thomas. *A Potion for the Heart-plague, as a soueraigne remedie for the other: Set downe in a letter sent vnto the humble in spirit*. London: Arnold Hatfield, 1603.

Davies, John, of Hereford. *Mirum in modum. A Glimpse of Gods Glorie and The Soules Shape*. London: William Aspley, 1602.

—. *Microcosmos. The Discovery of the Little World, with the government thereof.* Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1603.

—. *Humours Heau'n on Earth; with The Civile Warres of Death and Fortune*. London: A. Islip, 1605.

—. *The Triumph of Death: or, The Picture of the Plague: According to the Life, as it was in Anno Domini 1603*. London: A. Islip, 1605.

—. *Summa Totalis*. London: William Jaggard, 1607.

Defoe, Daniel. *A Journal of the Plague Year*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Dekker, Thomas. *Lanthorne and Candle-Light*. London: John Busby, 1609.

—. *The Ravens Almanacke. Fortelling of a Plague, Famine, and Civill Warre*. London: Thomas Archer, 1609.

—. *The Seuen deadly Sins of London drawn in seueral coaches, through the seuen seueral gates of the City; bringing the plague with them [1606]*. Ed. Edward Arber. London: The English Scholar's Library of Old and Modern Works, 1880.

—. *The Gull's Hornbook by Thomas Dekker*. Ed. R.B. McKerrow. London: Alexander Moring, 1905.

—. *The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker*. Ed. F.P. Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

—. *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 5 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.

—. *Thomas Dekker: The Wonderful Year; The Gull's Hornbook; Penny-Wise, Poundfoolish; English Villainies Discovered by Lantern and Candlelight and Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Dod, J. *Three Godlie and Frvitful Sermons*. London: William Welby, 1610.

Donne, George. *The signes that doe declare a person to be infected with the pestilence*. London: T. Snodham, 1625.

Donne, John. *Deaths Dvell, Or, A Consolation to the Soule, against the dying Life, and liuing Death of the Body*. London: Thomas Harper, 1632.

—. *The Life and Letters of John Donne Dean of St. Paul's*. Ed. Edmund Gosse. 2 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1899.

—. *John Donne: Selected Prose*. Eds. Helen Gardner and Timothy Healy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

—. *John Donne: Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967.

—. *The Complete English Poems of John Donne*. Ed. C.A. Patrides. London: J.M. Dent, 1985.

—. *John Donne: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*. Ed. John Carey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Downame, John. *Spiritual physicke to cure the diseases of the soule, arising from the superfluitie of choller, prescribed out of Gods word*. London: William Jones, 1600.

Drout, Pierre. *A new Counsell against the Pestilence, declaring what kinde of disease it is, of what cause it procedeth, the signes and tokens thereof: With the order of curing the same*. Trans. T. Twyne. London: J. Charlewood, 1578.

Earle, John. *Microcosmograpy Or A Piece of the World Discovered in Essays and Characters* [1628]. Ed. Harold Osborne. London. University Tutorial Press, 1933.

Egerton, Stephen. *The Boring of the Eare, Contayning a Discourse by way of Dialogue concerning hearing the word of God*. London: W. Stansby, 1623.

Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Ed. E.S. De Beer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.

England and Wales, Sovereign. *By the King: The care wee haue to preuent all occasions of disposing the infection amongst our people, doth sufficiently appeare by our former proclamation...* London: Robert Barker, 1603.

Enright, E.N. *The Oxford Book of Death*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Ewich, John. *Of the duetie of a faithfull and wise Magistrate, in preseruing and deliuering of the common wealth from infection, in the time of Plague or Pestlence: Two Books*. London: Thomas Dawson, 1583.

Fenton, Roger. *A Perfume against the noysome Pestilence*. London: R. Read, 1603.

Fletcher, Giles and Phineas. *Poetical Works*. Ed. Frederick S. Boas. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Florio, John. *Second Frutes* [1591]. Gainsville: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1953.

—. *A Worlde of Wordes, Or Most copious, and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English* [1598]. New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972.

Forman, Simon. *The Autobiography and Personal Diary of Dr. Simon Forman, The Celebrated Astrologer, from A.D. 1552, to A.D. 1602 from the unpublished manuscripts in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford*. Ed. James O. Halliwell. London: 1849.

Forrester, James. *The Marrow and Ivice of Two Hvndred and Sixtie Scriptvres*. London: Simon Waterson, 1611.

Fuller, Thomas. *A Sermon Intended for Pavl's Crosse, But Preached in the Chvrch of St. Pavl's. Upon the late Decrease and withdrawing of Gods heavie Visitation of the Pestilence from the said Citie*. B. Alsop and T. Fawcet, London: 1626.

G., C. *The Minte of Deformities*. London: G. Simson, 1600.

Gascoigne, George. *The Droomme of Doomes day*. London: T. East, 1576.

—. *The Complete Works of George Gascoigne*. Vol. 3. Cambridge University Press, 1910.

Geoffrey of Monmouth. *The History of the Kings of Britain*. Trans. Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.

Gerard, John. *The herball*. London: E. Bollifant, 1597.

Godskall, John. *The Arke of Noah, For the Londoners that remaine in the Cittie to enter in with their families, to be preserued from the deluge of the Plague*. London: Thomas Creede, 1604.

Godskall, James. *The kings medicine for this present yeere 1604*. London: Edward White, 1604.

Googe, Barnabe. *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* [1563]. Ed. Edward Arber. London: Constable and Company, 1910.

Gorges, Sir Arthur. *The Poems of Sir Arthur Gorges*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Gosson, Stephen. *The Schoole of Abuse* [1579]. Ed. Arthur Freeman. New York: Garland Publishing, 1973.

Gouge, William. *Gods Three Arrowes: Plagve, Famine, Sword, In three Treatises.* London: G. Miller, 1631.

Gransden, K.W. Ed. *Tudor Verse Satire*. London: Athlone Press, 1970.

Grigson, Geoffrey. *Oxford Book of Satirical Verse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Gray, Robert. *An Alarvm to England, Sounding the most fearefull and terrible example of Gods vengeance, that euer was inflicted in this world vpon mankind for sinne.* London: John Budge, 1609.

Greene, Robert. *The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene.* Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 15 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.

—. *The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* [1589]. Ed. A.W. Ward. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

—. *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit. Bought with a Million of Repentance*. Ed. D. Allen Carroll. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1994.

Greenham, Richard. *A most Sweete and assured Comfort for all those in Conscience, or troubled in mind.* London: William Jones, 1595.

Grose, Francis. *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* [1785]. Menston: Scolar Press, 1988.

Guilpin, Everard. *Skialetheia or A Shadow of Truth, in Certaine Epigrams and Satyres* [1598]. Ed. D. Allen Carroll. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1974.

H., A.. *London Looke-backe: A description or representation of the great and memorable Mortality An. 1625, in Heroicke matchless lines.* Cambridge: Trinity Colledge, 1625.

—. *The Description of the late great, memorable and prodigious Plague 1625.* Cambridge: Trinity Colledge, 1625.

H., I. *This World's Folly; or, A Warning Peece discharged upon the Wickedness thereof.* London: 1615.

H., S. *A new treatise of the pestilence, containing the causes, and cure thereof.* London. John Windet, 1603.

Hake, Edward. *Newes out of Powles Churchyarde*. London: J. Charlewood and R. Jones, 1579.

Hall, Joseph. *The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall.* Ed. A. Davenport. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1949.

---. *Heaven upon Earth and Characters of Vertues and Vices* [1606 & 1608]. Ed. Rudolf Kirk. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1948.

Hand. *The painefvll hand: shall rvle the lande*. London: 1620.

Harington, Sir John. *A New Discourse of a Stale Subject, Called the Metamorphosis of Ajax* [1596]. Ed. Elizabeth Story Donno. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

---. *Epigrams 1618*. Menston: Scolar Press, 1970.

Harris, Robert. *Hezekiah's Recovery*. London: R. Young, 1626.

Harrison, William. *The Description of England* [1587]. Ed. Georges Edelen. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968.

Harvey, Gabriel. *Gabriel Harvey: Fovre Letters and certaine Sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene and other parties by him abused* [1592]. Ed. G.B. Harrison. London: John Lane, 1922.

Harvey, William. *The Anatomical Lectures of William Harvey* [1616]. Ed. Gweneth Whitteridge. London: E. & S. Livingstone, 1964.

Hastler, Thomas. *An Antidote against the Plagve. or A Salue for all sores*. London: M. Flesher, 1625.

Henslowe, Philip. *Henslowe's Diary*. Ed. R.A. Foakes and R.T. Rickert.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Herbert, George. *The Works of George Herbert*. Ed. F.E. Hutchinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Heron, Edward. *Physicke for the body and soule Shewing that the Maladies of the one, proceede from the sinnes of the other*. London: J. Legatt, 1621

Herrick, Robert. *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*. Ed. L.C. Martin. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

Herring, Francis. *A Modest Defence of the Caveat Given to the Wearers of impoisoned Amulets, as Preseruatiues from the Plague*. London: Arnold Hatfield, 1604.

---. *Certaine Rvles, Directions or Advertisments for this time of pestilentiall contagion*. London: William Jones, 1625.

Heywood, John. *The Prouerbs, Epigrams, and Miscellanies of John Heywood*. Ed. J.S. Farmer. London: ETTS, 1906.

Hodges, Nathaniel. *Loimologia: Or , an Historical Account of the Plague in London in 1665: With Precautionary Directions against the Like Contagion*. Trans. John Quincy. London: E. Bell, 1720.

Holland, Henry. *Spiritvall Preseruatiues against the Pestilence or Seven Lectures on the 91. Psalme*. London: John Browne and Roger Jackson, 1603.

Horne, Robert. *A Caveat to preuent future Ivdgements: Or, An Admonition to all England; more specially, to London and other places where the death of the Plague hath lately beene*. London: G.M., 1626.

Huebert, Caspar. *A riche Storehouse, or Treasurie, for the Sicke, full of Christian counsels, wholesome doctrine, comfortable persuations, and godly meditations, meete for all Christians, both in sickenesse and in health*. Trans. Thomas Godfrie. London: Ralph Newberrie, 1578.

Hunnis, William. *Seven Sobs of a Sorrowfull Soule for Sinne*. London: H. Denham, 1583.

Jacobaeus, Vitus. *The anatomy of Martin Luther*. Coburg: 1567.

James I. *A Counterblaste to Tobacco*. London: R. Barker, 1604.

—. *By the King: a proclamation for a publike, generall, and solemne fast*. London: Bonham Norton and John Dill, 1625.

Jewell, John. *The Works of the Very Learned and Reverend Father in God Iohn Iewell*. London: John Norton, 1609.

Johnson, Richard. *Look on Me London*. London: T. Archer, 1613.

Jonson, Ben. *The Devil is an Ass*. Ed. William Savage Johnson. New York: Henry Holt, 1905.

—. *Ben Jonson's The Fountaine of Self-Love or Cynthia's Revels*. London: David Nutt, 1908.

—. *The Poems of Ben Jonson*. Ed. Bernard H. Newdigate. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936.

—. *The Complete Poetry of Ben Jonson*. Ed. William B. Hunter. New York: New York University Press, 1963.

—. *Bartholomew Fair*. Ed. Maurice Hussey. London: Ernest Benn, 1964.

—. *Ben Jonson: Selected Poetry*. Ed. George Parfitt. London: Penguin Books, 1992.

—. *The Alchemist*. Ed. Elizabeth Cook. London: A&C Black, 1991.

—. *Every Man in His Humour*. Ed. J.W. Lever. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971.

—. *The Staple of News*. Ed. Devra Rowland Kifer. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975.

—. *Volpone*. Ed. Philip Brockbank. London: A&C Black, 1991.

Kellwaye, Simon. *A Defensitive against the Plague*. London: John Windet, 1593.

Kemp, W. *A Brief Treatise of the Nature, Causes, Signes, Preservation From and Cure of The Pestilence*. London: D. Kemp, 1665.

L.,B. *The Sovles lamentations, and loue to God*. London: Thomas Purfoot, 1614.

Lanyer, Aemelia. *The Poems of Aemelia Lanyer: Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*. Ed. Susanne Woods. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Leighton, Sir William. *The Teares or Lamentations of a sorrowfull Soule*. London: Ralph Blower, 1613.

Lo, Barry. *Ram-Alley or Merrie-Trickes*. London: G. Eld, 1611.

Lodge, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge*. 4 vols. London: The Hunterian Club, 1966.

London. *A true bill of the whole number that hath died in the Cittie of London, the citty of Westminster, the citty of Norwich, and divers other places*. London: I.R., 1603.

Lupton, Donald. *London and the Countrey carbaonadoed and quartered into severall characters*. London: N. Oakes, 1632.

Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works*. Ed. Franklin Sherman. Vol. 47. Philadelphia: Fortune Press, 1971.

Lyly, John. *The Complete Works of John Lyly*. Ed. R. Warwick Bond. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.

M., M. *An Ease for a diseased Man*. London: W. Jones, 1625.

MacBeth, George, Ed. *The Penguin Book of Sick Verse*. London: Penguin Books, 1963.

Man. *The Sicke-Mans Comfort, against Death and the Deuill, the Law and Sinne, the Wrath and Iudgement of God*. Trans. I.E. London: John Wolfe, 1590.

Man, Abraham. *An Amvlet, or Preservative against Sicknes and Death: In Two Parts*. London: R. Field, 1617.

Manning, James. *A new booke, intituled, I am for you all, Complexions castle: as well in the time of pestilence, as other times, out of the which you may learne your complexion, your disease incident to the same, and the remedies for the same*. London: J. Legat, 1604.

Manley, Lawrence, ed. *London in the Age of Shakespeare: An Anthology*. University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Tamburlaine the Great: Parts I and II* [1587]. Ed. John D. Dump. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

—. *The Tragicall History of Doctor Faustus* [1593]. Ed. Irving Ribner. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1966.

Marmion, Shakerley. *The Soddered Citizen*. Ed. W.W. Greg. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Marston, John. *The Works of John Marston*. Ed. A.H. Bullen. 3 vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 1887.

—. *The Poems of John Marston*. Ed. Arnold Davenport. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1961.

—. *The Scourge of Villanie* [1599]. Ed. G.B. Harrison. London: John Lane, 1925.

—. *The Malcontent* [1604]. Ed. Bernard Harris. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.

Martz, Louis L., ed. *The Anchor Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Verse*. 2 Vols. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1969.

Marvell, Andrew. *The Complete Works of Andrew Marvell in Four Volumes*. New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Meres, Francis. *Wits Treasvry Being the Second part of Wits Commonwealth*. London: P. Short, 1598.

Middleton, Thomas. *Microcynicon or Sixe Snarling Satires*. London: 1599.

—. *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*. London: Francis Constable, 1630.

—. *The Works of Thomas Middleton*. Ed. A.H. Bullen. 8 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1885.

—. *The Phoenix: A Critical, Modernized Edition*. Ed. John Bradbury Brooks. New York: Garland Publishing, 1980.

Milton, Richard. *Londoners Their Entertainment in the Countrie. Or the Whipping of Runnawayes*. London: H. Lownes, 1604.

Moore, John. *A mappe of Mans Mortalitie. Clearely manifesting the originall of Death, with the Nature, Fruits, and Effects thereof, bothto the Vnregenerate, and Elect Children of God*. London: George Edwards, 1617.

More, John. *A Lively Anatomie of Death*. London: W. Jones, 1596.

More, Sir Thomas. *The Yale Edition of the Complete Works of Sir Thomas More*. Ed. John M. Headley. Trans. Sister Scholastica Mandeville. Vol. 5. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

—. *Utopia*. London: J.M. Dent, 1994.

Muggins, William. *Londons Mourning Garment or Funerall Teares: worne and shed for the death of her wealthy Cittizens, and other her inhabitants.* London: Ralph Blower, 1603.

Nashe, Thomas. *The Unfortunate Traveller* [1594]. London: John Lehmann, 1948.

—. *The Works of Thomas Nashe*. Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow. 5 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

Nausea, Fridericus . *Of all blasing stars in generall*. Trans. A. Fleming. London: Thomas Woodcocke, 1578.

Nixon, Anthony. *The Blacke yeare*. London: E. Alde, 1606.

Norden, John. *A Sinfvll Mans Solace: Most swete and comfortable, for the sicke soule.* London: R. Jones, 1585.

Norris, Silvester. *An Antidote or Soveraigne against the Pestiferovs Writinges of all English Sectaries*. London: St. Omer College Press, 1619.

Oberndoerffer, Johann. *The anatomyes of the true phystion, and counterfeit mounte-banke*. Trans. Francis Herring. London: A. Johnson, 1602.

Osiander, Andreas. *How and whither a Chrysten man ought to flye the horrible Plague of the Pestilence*. London: Edward Askell, 1537.

Overbury, Thomas. *The "Conceited Newes" of Sir Thomas Overbury and His Friends* [1613]. Ed. James E. Savage. Gainesville: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968.

Passing Bell. *A passing bell towling to call us to mind, Our time evill spending, a plague now we find*. London: J. Allde, 1625.

Perkins, William. *A Treatise Tending Vnto A Declaration, Whether A Man Be In the Estate of damnation, or in the estate of grace*. London: R. Robinson, 1590.

—. *A salue for a sicke man, or, the right manner of dying well.* London: J. Legate, 1595.

Pestell, Thomas. *Morbus epidemicus, or the churles sickenesse*. London: T. Creede, 1615.

Petowe, Henry. *The Countrie Ague or, London her Welcome home to her retired Children.* London: R. Allot, 1626.

Philpot, John. *The examinacion of the Constaunt martir of Christ J.* London: E. Emden, 1556.

Platter, Thomas. *Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599*. Trans. Clare Williams. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.

Preston, John. *Two Godly and Learned Treatises upon Mortification and Humiliation*. London: Andrew Crooke, 1635.

—. *A Liveles Life: Or, Mans Spirituall death in Sinne*. London: Andrew Crooke, 1635.

Price, Sampson. *Londons Remembrancer: For the Staying of the Contagiovs Sicknes of the Plagve: By Dauids Memoriall.* London: Thomas Harper, 1626.

Pricke, Robert. *A Verie Godlie and Learned Sermon, treating of Mans mortalitie.* London: Thomas Creede, 1608.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie* [1589]. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1968.

Rabelais, François. *Gargantua And Pantagruel*. Trans. Burton Raffel. New York: W.W. Norton, 1990.

Raleigh, Sir Walter. *The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh*. 8 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1964.

Randall, John. *The Description of Fleshy Lusts, Or A Profitable ad Frvitfvll Sermon Vpon the first Epistle of Saint Peter*. London: J. Dawson, 1622.

Randolph, Thomas. *The Poems of Thomas Randolph*. Ed. G. Thorn-Drury. London: Frederick Etchells & Hugh MacDonald, 1929.

—. *The Drinking Academy* [1624]. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Rankins, William. *A Mirrovr of Monsters: Wherein is plainely described the manifold vices & spotted enormities, that are caused by the infectious sight of Playes, with the description of the subtile slights of Sathan, making them his instruments.* London: I.C, 1587.

—. *Seauen Satires Applyed to the weeke, including the worlds ridiculous follyes* [1598]. Ed. A. Davenport. London: University Press of Liverpool, 1948.

Rawlidge, Richard. *A Monster Late Fovnd Ovt and Discovered Or The Scourging of Tiplers, the ruine of Bacchus, and the bane of Tapsters*. Amsterdam: 1628.

Red Cross. *The red-crosse: or, England's lord have mercy upon vs.* London: F.J. Trundle, 1625.

Rich, Barnaby. *Favltes favlts and nothing else but favltes.* London: V. Simes, 1606.

Robertson, Bartholomew. *Anatomie of a distressed Soule*. London: Nicholas Okes, 1619.

Rous, Francis. *The Diseases of the Time, Attended by their Remedies*. London: William Stansby, 1622.

—. *Oile of Scorpions. The Miseries of these Times turned into Medicines and Curing themiselues.* London: William Stansby, 1623.

—. *The Onely Remedy, That Can Cvre a People, When all other Remedies faile*. London: James Boler, 1627.

Rowlands, Samuel. *Hell's broke loose*. London: W. White, 1605.

—. *A Terrible Battell betweene the two consumers of the Whole world: Time, and Death*. London: 1606.

—. *The Complete Works of Samuel Rowlands 1598-1628*. 3 vols. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1880.

Rudierd, Edmund. *The Thvnderbolt of Gods Wrath Against Hard-Hearted and stiffe-necked sinners, or an Abridgement of the Theater of Gods feareful judgements executed vpon notorious sinners*. London: W. Jones, 1618.

Sanford, John. *Gods arrowe of the pestilence*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1604.

Sclater, William [the Elder]. *A Threefold Preseruatiue against three dangerouse diseases of these latter times. 1. Non proficiency in grace. 2. Fals-hearted hypocrisie. 3. Back-sliding in Religion*. London: S. Stafford, 1610.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

—. *The Play of Sir Thomas More in Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More*. Eds. Alfred Pollard, W.W. Greg, E. Maunde Thompson, J. Dover Wilson and R.W. Chambers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*. Ed. William A. Ringler Jr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

—. *An Apology for Poetry or The Defence of Poesy* [1595]. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd. London: Thomas Nelson, 1965.

Skeyne, Gilbert. *Ane Breve Description of the Pest*. Edinburgh: R. Lekpreuik, 1568.

Southwell, Robert. *The Poems of Robert Southwell*. Eds. James H. McDonald and Nancy Pollard Brown. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Speght, Rachel. *A Mouzell For Melastomvs, The Cynicall Bayter of, and foule mouthed Barker against Evahs Sex*. London: Nicholas Okes, 1617.

—. *Mortalities Memorandvm With A Dreame Prefixed, imaginarie in manner; reall in matter*. London: Edward Griffin, 1621.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. Thomas P. Roche. New York: Penguin Books, 1978.

—. *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*. Eds. William A. Owram, Einar Bjorvand, Ronald Bond, Thomas H. Cain, Alexander Dunlop, and Richard Schell. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Stockwood, John. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse*. London: 1578.

Stow, John. *A Survey of London by John Stow. Reprinted from the Text of 1603*. Ed. Charles Lethbridge Kingsford. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Stubbes, Phillip. *The Anatomie of Abuses* [1583]. Ed. Arthur Freeman. London: Garland Publishing, 1973.

Sutcliffe, Alice. *Meditations of Man's Mortalitie. Or, A Way to Trve Blessednesse*. London: B. Alsop, 1633.

Swadling, Thomas. *Sermons, Meditations, and Prayers, upon the Plague*. London: N. Okes, 1636.

Swift, Jonathan. *The Writings of Jonathan Swift*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1973.

Sylvester, Joshua. *The Complete Works of Joshua Sylvester*. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 2 vols. London: Chertsey Worthie's Library, 1880.

Sylvester, Richard S. Ed. *English Seventeenth-Century Verse*. Vol. 2. New York: W.W. Norton, 1969.

T., W. *A Casting Vp of accounts of certain Errors, being answered in Items, to the Summa Totalis. London: Thomas Creede, 1603.*

Taylor, John. *The Fearefull Svmmer: or Londons Calamity, and countries courtesy, and both their misery*. Oxford: John Lichfield and William Turner, 1625.

—. *Works of John Taylor the Water Poet*. 2 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

Thayre, Thomas. *A treatise of the pestilence*. London: E. Short, 1603.

Thomson, George, M.D. *Loimotomia: or the Pest Anatomized*. London: Nathaniel Crouch, 1666.

Tourneur, Cyril. *The Works of Cyril Tourneur*. Ed. Allardyce Nicoll. London: Fanfrolico Press, 1929.

Trapp, John. *Gods Love-Tokens and the Afflicted Mans Lessons: Brought to light, and sayd before him in two fruitfull and seasonable Discourses upon Revel, 3.19*. London: Richard Badger, 1637.

Underwood, Robert. *A New Anatomie. Wherein the Body of man is very fit and aptly (two wayes) compared: 1 To a Household. 2 To a Citie*. London: William Jones, 1605.

—. *The Little World. Or, A Liuely Description of all the partes and properties of Man*. London: W. Jones, 1612.

Venner, Tobias. *Via Recta ad vita longam*. London: G. Eld, 1620.

Vicary, Thomas. *The Englishe Mans Treasvre, or Treasor for Englishmen: With the true Anatomye of Mans Body*. London: John Windet, 1586.

—. *The Anatomie of the Bodie of Man* [1548]. Eds. Fredk. J. Furnivall and Percy Furnivall. London: Early English Text Society, 1888.

W., I. *A Briefe Treatise of the Plague Wherein is shewed, The Naturall cause of Plague. The Preseruations from the infection. The Way to cure the infected.* London: V. Sims, 1603.

Waldstein, Baron. *The Diary of Baron Waldstein: A Traveller in Elizabethan England*. Trans. G.W. Gross. London: Thames and Hudson, 1981.

Walkington, Thomas. *The Optick Glasse of Hvmors*. London: John Windet, 1607.

Ward, A.W. Ed. *Old English Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

Warde, William. *Gods Arrowes, or Two Sermons, concerning the visitation of God by the Pestilence*. London: Henry Ballard, 1607.

Webster, John. *The Duchess of Malfi* [1623]. Ed. Elizabeth M. Brennan. London: A & C Black, 1990.

Weever, John. *Faunus and Melliflora* [1600]. Ed. A. Davenport. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1948.

—. *The Whipper Pamphlets* [1601]. Ed. A. Davenport. 2 vols. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1951.

White, Francis. *Dead Souls*. London, 1619.

White, Thomas. *A Sermon preached at Pawles Crosse on Sunday the thirde of Nouember 1577 in the time of the Plague*. London: Francis Coldock, 1578.

Wilson, Robert. *An Edition of Robert Wilson's Three Ladies of London and Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* [1584, 1590]. H.S.D. Mithal Ed. New York: Garland Publishing, 1988.

Wither, George. *Abuses stript, and whipt. Or satirical essayes*. London: G. Eld, 1613.

—. *Britain's Remembrancer* [1625]. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

—. *The History of the Pestilence* [1626]. Ed. J. Milton French. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Wood, Owen. *An Alphabetical Book of Physicall Secrets, For all those Diseases that are most predominant and dangerous (curable by Art) in the Body of Man*. London: J. Norton, 1639.

Woolton, John. *A Newe Anatomie of whole man, aswell as of his body, as of his Soule*. London: Thomas Purfoote, 1576.

Woudhuysen, H.R., ed. *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse: 1509-1659*. London: Allen Lane, 1992.

Wright, Robert. *A Receyt to Stay the Plagve*. London: I.N., 1630.

Wroth, Lady Mary. *Lady Mary Wroth's Poems: A Modernized Edition*. Ed. R.E. Pritchard. Keele: Keele University Press, 1996.

Wycliffe, John. *Select Works of Joby Wyclif*. Ed. T. Arnold. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869.

Secondary Bibliography

Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1988.

Ackerknecht, Erwin H. *History and Geography of the Most Important Diseases*. New York: Hafner, 1965.

Angeles, Peter. *Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1981.

Anselment, Raymond A. *The Realms of Apollo: Literature and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995.

Anspaugh, Kelly. "The Powers of Ordure: James Joyce and the Excremental Vision(s)" *Mosaic* 27/1 (March 1994): 73-99.

Archer, Ian. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Artaud, Antonin. *The Theatre and Its Double*. Trans. Mary Caroline Richards. New York: Grove Press, 1979.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Barish, Jonas. "The Turning Away of Prince Hal" *Shakespeare Studies 1* (1965): 9-17.

Barkan, Leonard. *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Barker, Felix and Peter Jackson, eds. *London: 2000 Years of a City and its People*. London: Cassell, 1974.

Barker, Francis. *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection*. London: Methuen, 1984.

Barroll, Leeds. *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater: The Stuart Years*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Beaty, Nancy Lee. *The Craft of Dying: A Study in the Literary Tradition of the Ars Moriendi in* England. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Beier, A.L. and Roger Finlay , eds. *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis*. New York: Longman, 1986.

Beier, Lucinda McCray. *Sufferers and Healers: The Experience of Illness in Seventeenth-Century England*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.

Bell, Walter George. *The Great Plague in London in 1665*. London: John Lane, 1979.

Bloom, Edward A. and Lillian D. Bloom, eds. *Satire's Persuasive Voice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Bloch, R. Howard and Frances Ferguson , eds. *Misogyny, Misandry, and Misanthropy*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.

Boehrer, Bruce Thomas. *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

Bowers, Rick. "Antidote to the Plague: Thomas Dekker's Story-Telling in *The Wonderfull Yeare* [1603]" *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* (No. 3, 1992): 229-239.

Brennan, William. *Dehumnanizing the Vulnerable: When Word Games Take Lives*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1995.

Bristol, Michael D. *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. London: Methuen, 1985.

Brittin, Norman A. *Thomas Middleton*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1972.

Brody, Howard. *Stories of Sickness*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Brody, Saul Nathaniel *The Disease of the Soul: Leprosy in Medieval Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.

Brown, George Hardin. *Bede the Venerable*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987.

Brown, Norman O. *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1985.

Brooke, Nicholas. *Horrid Laughter in Jacobean Tragedy*. London: Open Books, 1979.

Burford, E.J. *The Orrible Sin: A Look at London Lechery from Roman to Cromwellian Times*. London: Dalder & Boyars, 1973.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Campbell, Eva M. *Satire in Early English Drama*. Columbus: F.J. Heer, 1914.

Carson, Neil. *A Companion to Henslowe's Diary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Cartwright, Frederick F. *A Social History of Medicine*. London: Longman, 1977.

Cavendish, Richard. *Visions of Heaven and Hell*. New York: Harmony Books, 1977.

Clarke, Bruce and Wendell Aycock, eds. *The Body and The Text: Comparative Essays in Literature and Medicine*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 1990.

Classen, Constance, David Howes and Anthony Synott, eds. *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Clayborough, Arthur. *The Grotesque in English Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Colebrook, Claire. *New Literary Histories: New Historicism and Contemporary Criticism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Copeman, W.S.C. *Doctors and Disease in Tudor Times*. London: Dawson's of Pall Mall, 1960.

Corbin, Alain. *The Foul and the Fragrant: Odor and the French Social Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Corbett, Edward P.J. Ed. *Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Crupi, Charles W. *Robert Greene*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986.

Craig, D.H. *Sir John Harington*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1985.

Craig, Edward, ed. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Crary, Jonathan, Michel Feher, Hal Foster and Sanford Kwinter, eds. *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*. 3 vols. New York: Urzone, 1989.

Crawfurd, Raymond. *Plague and Pestilence in Literature and Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.

Cuddon, J.A. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin, 1991.

Cunningham, Andrew and Perry Williams. "De-centring the 'big picture': *The Origins of Modern Science* and the modern origins of science. *The British Journal for the History of Science 26/91* (December 1993): 407-32.

Cunningham, Andrew. *The Anatomical Renaissance: The Resurrection of the Anatomical Projects of the Ancients*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997.

Davidson, Clifford and Thomas H. Seiler Eds. *The Iconography of Hell*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1992.

Day, A. Colin. *Roget's Thesaurus of the Bible*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.

Deaux, George *The Black Death 1347*. New York: Weybright and Talley, 1969.

Derrida, Jacques. *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Dictionary of National Biography. CD-ROM.

Dollimore, Jonathan *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde Freud to Foucault*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

—. *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Donker, Marjorie and George M. Muldrow, eds. *Dictionary of Literary-Rhetorical Convention of the English Renaissance*. London: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Dubos, Rene. *Mirage of Health: Utopias, Progress, and Biological Change*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1959.

Dundes, Alan. *Life is Like a Chicken Coop Ladder: A Portrait of German Culture Through Folklore*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Edwards, Paul. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 8 vols. New York: MacMillan Company, 1967.

Ekwall, Eilert. *Street-Names of the City of London*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History or Manners*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.

Engel, William E. *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in Early Modern England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.

Engen, Trygg. *Odor Sensation and Memory*. New York: Praeger, 1991.

Epstein, Julia *Altered Conditions: Disease, Medicine, and Storytelling*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Feinberg, Leonard. *Introduction to Satire*. Ames: Iowa State Press, 1967

Fernandez, James, ed. *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Forbes, Thomas Rogers. *Chronicle from Aldgate: Life and Death in Shakespeare's London*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.

Ford, Boris, ed. *Seventeenth Century Britain: The Cambridge Cultural History. Vol. 4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization*. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

—. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

—. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. Trans. A.M Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Fowler, Roger. *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*. London: Routledge, 1987.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

—. "The Nature of Satire" in *Satire: An Anthology*. Eds. Ashley Brown and John L. Kimmey. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

—. *The Great Code*. Toronto: Academic Press, 1982.

Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

—. *The Scapegoat*. Trans. Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Gittings, Clare. *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England*. London: Croom Helm, 1984.

Gordon, Benjamin Lee. *Medieval and Renaissance Medicine*. London: Peter Owen, 1959.

Gottfried, Robert S. *The Black Death: Natural and Human Disaster in Medieval Europe*. London: The Free Press, 1983.

Green, A. Wigfall. *Sir Francis Bacon*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1966.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

—. *Shakespearean Negotiations; The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

Gregg, Kate L. *Thomas Dekker: A Study in Economic and Social Backgrounds*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1924.

Gregory, J.W. *The Story of the Road*. London: Alexander Maclehose, 1931.

Grell, Ole Peter and Andrew Cunningham, eds. *Medicine and the Reformation*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Groden, Michael and Martin Kreiswirth. *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Grun, Bernard, ed. *The Timetables of History*. 3rd ed. Toronto: Simon & Schuster, 1991.

Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hahn, Robert A. *Sickness and Healing: An Anthropological Perspective*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Haley, Michael Cabot. *The Semeiosis of Poetic Metaphor*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Hamilton, Paul. *Historicism*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Harben, Henry A. *A Dictionary of London*. London: Herbert Jenkins, 1916.

Hardison, O.B. Jr. *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise and Blame in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962.

Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. *On the Grotesque: Strategies of Contradiction in Art and Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Harré, Rom and Grant Gillett, eds. *The Discursive Mind*. London: Sage Publications, 1994.

Harrison, G.B. *An Elizabethan Journal: Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of During the Years 1591-1594*. London: Constable, 1928.

—. *A Last Elizabethan Journal: Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of During the Years 1599-1603*. London: Constable, 1933.

—. *A Jacobean Journal: Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of During the Years 1603-1606*. London: Routledge, 1946.

Hart, Jonathan Locke. *Theatre and World: The Problematics of Shakespeare's History*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992.

—. *Northrop Frye: The Theoretical Imagination*. London: Routledge, 1994.

—. "Anatomy of Disgust." *Mattoid* 48 (1994): 49-58.

—. ed. *Imagining Culture: Essays in Early Modern History and Literature*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.

Henderson, Jeffrey. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language In Attic Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Henke, James T. *Gutter Life and Language in the Early 'Street' Literature of England*. West Cornwall: Locust Hill Press, 1988.

—. *Courtesans and Cuckolds: A Glossary of Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare)*. London: Garland Press, 1979.

—. *Renaissance Dramatic Bawdy (Exclusive of Shakespeare): An Annotated Glossary and Critical Essays*. Vol. 2. Salzburg: Universtät Salzburg, 1974.

Hensley, Charles S. *The Later Career of George Wither*. The Hague: Mouton, 1969.

Highet, Gilbert. *The Anatomy of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Hilton, Della. *Who was Kit Marlowe?: The Story of the Poet and Playwright*. New York: Taplinger Publishing, 1977.

Hoeniger, F. David. *Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992.

Hodgart, Matthew. *Satire*. New York: World University Library, 1969.

Hopkins, Edward S. *Elements of Sanitation*. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1939.

Horrox, Rosemary. *The Black Death*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Howard, Donald R. *Chaucer: His Life, His Work, His World*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1987.

Hudson, Robert P. *Disease and Its Control: The Shaping of Modern Thought*. London: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Hufton, Olwen. *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe. Volume One 1500-1800*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

Hutson, Lorna. *Thomas Nashe in Context*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Kay, Sarah and Miri Rubin, eds. *Framing Medieval Bodies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Jackson, Felix and Peter, eds. *London: 2000 Years of a City and its People*. London: Cassell, 1974.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Keller, Katherine Z. and Gerald J. Schiffhorst, eds. *The Witness of Times: Manifestations of Ideology in Seventeenth Century England*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1993.

Kenyon, J.P. *The Wordsworth Dictionary of British History*. Ware: Wordsworth Reference, 1994.

Kern, Gail Paster. *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Kernan, Alvin. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Kimbrough, Robert. *Sir Philip Sidney*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971.

Kinney, Arthur F. and Dan S. Collins, eds. *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.

Kirby, Vicki. *Telling Flesh: The Substance of the Corporeal*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Klein, Ernest. *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Elsevier Publishing, 1971.

Knapp, Peter H. "Purging and Curbing: An Inquiry into Disgust, Satiety and Shame." *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. Vol. 144 No. 6 (1967): 514 534.

Knoll, Robert E. *Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969.

Kohn, George C., ed. *Encyclopedia of Plague and Pestilence*. New York: Facts on File, 1995.

Kristeva, Julia. *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Kubie, Lawrence. "The Fantasy of Dirt." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* No. 6 (1937): 388-425.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, eds. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Lassek, A.M. *Human Dissection: Its Drama and Struggle*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1958.

Leasor, James. *The Plague and the Fire*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962.

Lewis, Michael and Jeannette M. Haviland, eds. *Handbook of Emotions*. New York: The Gilford Press, 1993.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Lawrence, Robert Means. *Primitive Psycho-Therapy and Quackery*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1910.

Le Guérer, Annick. *Scent: The Mysterious and Essential Powers of Smell*. Trans. Richard Miller. London: Chatto & Windus, 1993.

Leavy, Barbara Fass. *To Blight With Plague: Studies in a Literary Theme*. New York: New York University Press, 1992.

Gordon, Benjamin Lee. *Medieval and Renaissance Medicine*. London: Peter Owen, 1959.

Mack, Arien, ed. *In Time of Plague: The History and Social Consequences of Lethal Epidemic Disease*. New York: New York University Press, 1991.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics.* New York: AMS Press, 1987.

Manley, Lawrence, ed. *London in the Age of Shakespeare: An Anthology*. University Park: University of Pennsylvania, 1986.

—. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Margolis, Joseph. *The Flux of History and the Flux of Science*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993.

Martin, Julian. *Francis Bacon, the State, and the Reform of Natural Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

McGinn, Donald J. *Thomas Nashe*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981.

Elizabeth McCutcheon "William Bullein's Dialogue Against the Fever Pestilence: A Sixteenth Century Anatomy." *Miscellanea Moreana: Essays for Germain Marc'hadour*. Eds. Clare M. Murphy, et al. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1989.

McLaughlin, Terence. *Coprophilia or A Peck of Dirt*. London: Cassell, 1971.

McNeill, William H. *Plagues and Peoples*. New York: Quality Paperback Book Club, 1976.

Miller, William Ian. *Humiliation: And Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

—. *The Anatomy of Disgust*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Mullett, Charles F. *The Bubonic Plague and England: An Essay in the History of Preventitive Medicine*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1956.

Neill, Michael. *Issues of Death: Mortality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Nikiforuk, Andrew *The Fourth Horseman: A Short History of Epidemics, Plagues, Famine and Other Scourges*. Toronto: Viking Penguin, 1991.

Nohl, Johannes *The Black Death: A Chronicle of the Plague Compiled From Contemporary Sources*. London: Unwin Books, 1961.

O'Hara-May, Jane. *Elizabethan Dyetary of Health*. Lawrence: Coronado Press, 1977.

O'Neill, John. *Five Bodies: The Human Shape of Modern Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Ormond, Rosalie. *Mutual Accusations: Seventeenth Century Body & Soul Dialogues in their Literary and Theological Context.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Ousby, Ian, Ed. *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Outram, Dorinda. *The Body and the French Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Page, Robert M. *Stigma*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.

Parker, Derek. *John Donne and His World*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1975.

Patrides, C.A. and Joseph Wittreich Eds. *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature: Patterns, Antecedents and Repercussions*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Partridge, Eric. *Shakespeare's Bawdy: A Literary & Psychological Essay and a Comprehensive Glossary*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.

Patton, Cindy. *Sex and Germs: The Politics of AIDS*. Boston: South End Press, 1985.

Paulson, Ronald, ed. *Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Persaud, T.V.N. *Early History of Human Anatomy: From Antiquity to the Beginning of the Modern Era*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1984.

Pollington, Stephen. *Wordcraft*. Pinner, Middlesex: Anglosaxon Books, 1993.

Pops, Martin. "The Metamorphosis of Shit." *Salmagundi* Spring 56 (1982): 27-61.

Preminger, Alex, ed. *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Priestley, Harold *London: The Years of Change*. London: Frederick Muller, 1966.

Ranger, Terence and Paul Slack, eds. *Epidemics and Ideas: Essays on the Historical Perception of Pestilence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Reznek, Lawrie. *The Nature of Disease*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1987.

Rhodes, Neil. *Elizabethan Grotesque*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

Riggs, David. *Ben Jonson: A Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Robertson, Alton Kim. *The Grotesque Interface: Deformity, Debasement, Dissolution*. Vervuert: Iberoamericana, 1996.

Rogers, Katherine M. *The Troublesome Helpmate: A History of Misogyny in Literature*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1966.

Rollfinke, Deiter and Jacqueline. *The Call of Human Nature: The Role of Scatology in Modern German Literature*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.

Rosebury, Theodor. *Life on Man*. New York: Viking Press, 1969.

Russell, K.F. *British Anatomy 1525-1800: A Bibliography of Works Published in Britain, America and on the Continent*. Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1987.

Ruthven, K.K. *The Conceit*. London: Methuen, 1969.

Sachs, Arieh. *The English Grotesque: An Anthology form Langland to Joyce*. Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1969.

Sagarin, Edward. *The Anatomy of Dirty Words*. New York: Lyle Stuart, 1962.

Sandblom, Philip. *Creativity and Disease: How Illness Affects Literature, Art and Music*. Philadelphia: G.B. Lippincott, 1989.

Sawday, Johnathan. *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Sayle, R.T.D. *Notes on the South-East Corner of Chancery Lane 1119 to 1929*. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1929.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

—., ed. *Fins de Siècle: English Poetry in 1590, 1690, 1790, 1890, 1990*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Schoenbaum, Samuel. *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Schofield, John. *The London Surveys of Ralph Treswell*. London: London Topographical Society, 1987.

Sennett, Richard. *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1994.

Shengold, Leonard. *Halo in the Sky: Observations on Anality and Defense*. London: Guilford Press, 1988.

Shilling, Chris. *The Body and Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications, 1993.

Shrewsbury, J.F.D. *A History of Bubonic Plague in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Singer, Charles. *Galen on Anatomical Procedures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.

—. *A Short History of Anatomy from the Greeks to Harvey*. New York: Dover Publications,1957.

Siraisi, Nancy G. *Medieval & Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Skeat, Walter, W. *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Slights, Camille Wells. *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert, and Milton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Simpson, J.A. & E.S.C. Weiner, eds. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 20 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon University Press, 1989.

Slack, Paul, ed. *The Plague Reconsidered: A New Look at its Origins and Effects in 16th and 17th Century England*. London: Local Population Studies, 1977.

---. *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Sloan, A.W. *English Medicine in the Seventeenth Century*. Durham: Durham Academic Press, 1996.

Small, F.L. *The Influent and the Effluent: The History of Urban Water Supply and Sanitation*. Saskatoon: Modern Press, 1974.

Smith. Al. *Dictionary of London Street Names*. New York: Arco Publications, 1970.

Smith, Geddes. *Plague On Us*. London: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Sontag, Susan. *Illness as Metaphor*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978.

---. *AIDS and Its Metaphors*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1989.

Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Spurgeon, Carol F.E. *Shakespeare's Imagery and What it Tells Us*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

Stafford, Barbara Maria. *Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Stapleton, Alan. *London Alleys, Byways & Courts*. London: John Lane, 1924

Stillman, Robert E. *Sidney's Poetic Justice: The Old Arcadia, Its Eclogues, and Renaissance Pastoral Traditions*. Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1986.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Summers, Charles J. and Ted-Larry Pebworth. *Ben Jonson*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979.

Synnot, Anthony. *The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Tacke, Nicholas, ed. *The History of the University of Oxford. Vol. 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Taylor, Michael J. *The Mystery of Suffering and Death*. New York: Alba House, 1973.

Teskey, Gordon. *Allegory and Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.

Thomson, Peter. *Shakespeare's Professional Career*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Thomson, Philip. *The Grotesque*. London: Methuen, 1972.

Thompson, Roger. *Unfit for Modest Ears: A Study of Pornographic, Obscene and Bawdy Works Written or Published in England in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century*. London: MacMillan Press, 1979.

Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London: Penguin, 1988.

Tricomi, Albert H. *Reading Tudor-Stuart Texts Through Cultural Historicism*. Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1996.

Tripp, Rhoda Thomas. *The International Thesaurus of Quotations*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Turner, Bryan S. *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.

Twigg, Graham *The Black Death: A Biological Reappraisal*. New York: Schocken Books, 1985.

Tyacke, Nicholas, ed. *The History of the University of Oxford Vol IV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Webster, Charles, ed. *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Weinreb, Ben and Christopher Hibbert, eds. *The London Encylopaedia*. London: MacMillan, 1983.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imaginatinon in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1973.

Williams, David. *Deformed Discourse: The Function of the Monster in Mediaeval Thought and Literature*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.

Williams, Derek, ed. *New Concise Bible Dictionary*. Oxford: Lion Publishing, 1989.

Williams, Gordon. *A Glossary of Shakespeare's Sexual Language*. London: Athlone, 1997.

Wilson, F.P. *The Plague in Shakespeare's London*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Wilson, Robert R. "Introduction to The Disgust Issue" *Mattoid* 48 (1994): 1-11.

Worcester, David. *The Art of Satire*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1960.

Wraight, A.D. *Christopher Marlowe and Edward Alleyn*. Chichester: Adam Hart, 1993.

Wright, Lawrence. *Clean and Decent: The Fascinating History of the Bathroom and the Water Closet*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960.

Wylie. J.C. *The Wastes of Civilization*. London: Faber and Faber, 1954.

Ziegler, Philip. *The Black Death*. New York: The John Day Company, 1969.